TYLER LEROUX

Convergent Epistemology

A Framework for Evaluating Reality-Level Systems Through Cross-Domain Convergence

Copyright © 2026 by Tyler Leroux

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise without written permission from the publisher. It is illegal to copy this book, post it to a website, or distribute it by any other means without permission.

First edition

This book was professionally typeset on Reedsy.
Find out more at reedsy.com

Contents

1	Introduction: From Isolated Argument to Convergent...	1
2	Domain 1: Predictive Power (PCCRI)	28
3	Domain 2: Anomalous Event Integration (AEI)	44
4	Domain 3: Knowledge Production Capacity (IDCRI)	64
5	Domain 4: Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)	82
6	Domain 5: Experiential Coherence (ECRI)	100
7	Domain 6: Ultimate Explanatory Scope (UCRI)	118
8	Unified Convergence Model (UCM)	132
9	Conclusion: The Emergence of Convergent Evaluation	139
10	Domain Selection Justification: Toward a Complete and...	142
11	Domain Independence and Controlled Interdependence	147
12	Nature of Quantification	152
13	Comparator Selection: Scope, Representativeness, and...	158
14	Scope and Limits of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol	164
15	Calibration and Sensitivity Analysis: Stability Under...	170
16	Convergence Visualization	176
17	Illustrative References to Additional Worldviews	180
18	Methodological Safeguards	188
19	Unified Convergence Model: Formal Expression of WEP	195
20	Convergence Threshold and Interpretive Constraint	199
21	Author Position and Epistemic Posture	201
22	Limitations and Critiques	204
23	Scope and Generalizability of the Framework	212
24	Extension to Additional Worldviews	217

1

Introduction: From Isolated Argument to Convergent Evaluation

The question of how to evaluate competing explanations of reality remains unresolved. Most approaches operate within isolated domains—science, history, philosophy, or human experience—each treated as a separate field of inquiry. Arguments are developed and defended within these domains, but there is no consistent method for integrating them into a unified evaluation. As a result, systems are often assessed selectively rather than comprehensively, and comparison across domains remains structurally underdefined.

This fragmentation presents a persistent difficulty.

A worldview may perform strongly in one domain while appearing weaker in another. Scientific models may demonstrate predictive reliability, while philosophical systems address meaning and consciousness. Historical analysis may support certain claims, while experiential data suggests others. When these domains are considered independently, there is no consistent method for determining how they should be weighed relative to one another.

As a result, evaluation often becomes selective.

Arguments are emphasized or dismissed depending on prior commitments, disciplinary boundaries, or methodological preferences. What emerges is not a comprehensive assessment of a worldview's interaction with reality, but a series of partial evaluations that rarely converge into a single framework.

This work begins from a different premise.

Rather than asking which individual argument is most persuasive, it asks whether a worldview can be evaluated across multiple independent domains using a consistent set of criteria. If such an evaluation is possible, then the focus shifts from isolated arguments to system-level performance.

This shift introduces a new question:

Can reality-level systems be assessed through structured convergence?

To address this, the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is introduced as a multi-domain framework designed to measure how competing systems align with reality across distinct, non-overlapping dimensions. These dimensions include predictive capacity, anomalous data, knowledge production, macro-historical impact, and experiential coherence.

Each domain captures a different mode of interaction between a worldview and reality. Importantly, these domains are not reducible to one another. Predictive models do not replace historical development; anomalous events are not equivalent to scientific knowledge; subjective experience cannot be fully subsumed under empirical measurement. Yet all remain relevant to a comprehensive evaluation.

Domain Distinctness and Functional Independence

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) evaluates systems across multiple domains that are treated as independent for the purpose of analysis.

However, this independence should not be understood as absolute.

All domains of inquiry operate within broader cognitive, conceptual, and cultural frameworks. As a result, complete independence between domains is neither expected nor required.

What WEP assumes instead is functional independence.

Each domain is defined by distinct forms of data, methods of evaluation, and criteria for success. Predictive models rely on forward constraint and empirical validation. Anomalous data involves the handling of boundary conditions and deviations from expectation. Knowledge production reflects internal generative capacity. Macro-historical impact concerns long-term stability and influence. Experiential coherence engages subjective and phenomenological alignment.

While these domains may share certain underlying assumptions, they remain methodologically distinct in how they generate, interpret, and evaluate information.

The significance of convergence within WEP depends not on complete independence, but on the non-triviality of alignment across these distinct domains.

If multiple domains governed by different evaluative structures align under a single explanatory framework, this alignment cannot be reduced solely to shared background assumptions. Instead, it reflects a pattern that exceeds what would be expected from any one domain considered in isolation.

WEP therefore operates on a principle of constrained independence:

Domains are not fully independent, but sufficiently distinct such that convergence across them remains meaningful.

This distinction is critical. Without it, convergence could be dismissed as an artifact of shared assumptions. With it, convergence retains its role as an indicator of cross-domain constraint.

The central claim of this work is not that any single domain is decisive.

It is that the relationship between domains matters.

When independent domains—each governed by different types of data, methods, and standards—begin to align under a single explanatory framework, a pattern emerges that cannot be easily reduced to coincidence or selective interpretation. This pattern, referred to as convergence, becomes the primary object of analysis.

The aim, therefore, is not to eliminate disagreement, nor to collapse complexity into a single metric, but to establish a structured method for comparing systems across the full range of their interaction with reality.

In doing so, this work proposes a shift:

from evaluating arguments in isolation

to evaluating systems in convergence

This shift represents more than a refinement of existing methods. It introduces a different level of analysis—one concerned not with individual claims, but with the coherence of entire explanatory systems across independent domains.

The implications extend beyond any single worldview. If successful, this framework provides a way to evaluate competing explanations of reality using transparent, repeatable criteria without privileging one domain at the expense of others.

What follows is the development of that framework.

Reader Orientation

This work presents a structured framework rather than a linear argument. As such, it may be approached in different ways depending on the reader's objectives.

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is designed to operate as a system of analysis. It introduces multiple domains, each with its own criteria, variables, and interpretive boundaries. These domains are then integrated through a convergence model.

Readers should not expect a single continuous line of reasoning leading to a final conclusion. Instead, the framework develops cumulatively.

For first-time readers, the following approach may be helpful:

- Read the Introduction and the section on the Convergence Principle to understand the core idea
- Review the Methodology to see how the framework is structured
- Examine the Worked Example to observe how the system functions in practice
- Engage with individual domains as needed, rather than attempting to retain every detail simultaneously
- Return to the Conclusion after gaining familiarity with the structure

Not all sections carry equal weight for every reader. Some portions are more technical, while others are conceptual. The framework is designed to remain coherent even when read selectively.

The goal is not to produce immediate agreement, but to establish a structured way of approaching evaluation.

Readers are therefore encouraged to engage with the material at a pace appropriate to their level of interest and familiarity.

The Convergence Principle

At the center of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is a single structural idea:

Independent domains of evaluation do not remain isolated when applied to reality-level systems.

They interact.

They accumulate.

And, in certain cases, they converge.

Traditional approaches to evaluating worldviews often treat domains independently. Scientific arguments are assessed separately from historical claims. Philosophical reasoning is considered apart from experiential data. Each domain is analyzed within its own boundaries, with limited integration across fields.

Within this structure, a worldview may appear strong in one domain and weak in another, without any consistent method for evaluating the relationship between these performances.

WEP introduces a different approach.

Rather than evaluating domains in isolation, it examines what happens when multiple independent domains are considered together under a shared framework.

This leads to three structural observations:

First, performance in a single domain carries limited evaluative weight.

A worldview may exhibit strength in one area while remaining underdetermined overall.

Second, alignment across multiple domains increases evaluative constraint.

As additional independent domains are satisfied simultaneously, the range of plausible explanations narrows.

Third, sustained convergence across domains requires explanation.

When a single framework maintains coherence across predictive, anomalous, intellectual, historical, and experiential dimensions, the convergence itself becomes a feature that must be accounted for.

In this context, convergence does not function as proof.

It functions as pressure.

It reduces interpretive flexibility.

It limits the ability to treat each domain independently.

It shifts evaluation from isolated success to systemic coherence.

The significance of convergence lies not in any individual data point, but in

the increasing difficulty of maintaining alignment across domains that are governed by different types of data, methods, and standards.

WEP is therefore structured around this principle:

A worldview is not evaluated solely by how well it performs in any one domain, but by whether it can sustain alignment across multiple independent domains simultaneously.

This shift—from isolated evaluation to convergent evaluation—forms the conceptual foundation of the entire framework.

Overview: What This Framework Is and How to Read It

This work introduces a framework for evaluating systems of thought across multiple domains of reality.

Most discussions about truth are conducted within isolated domains. Scientific models are evaluated by predictive success, philosophical systems by logical coherence, historical claims by available evidence, and human experience by subjective alignment. These domains are typically treated as separate fields of inquiry, with no consistent method for integrating them into a single evaluation.

This creates a limitation.

A system may perform strongly in one domain while appearing weaker in another, and there is no shared structure for determining how those differences should be interpreted. As a result, evaluation often becomes selective rather than comprehensive.

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is designed to address this problem.

Instead of evaluating arguments in isolation, it evaluates systems based on how they perform across multiple domains simultaneously. The focus shifts from individual claims to overall system behavior.

In this framework, a "worldview" refers to any system that makes explanatory claims about reality across more than one domain. This includes, but is not limited to, philosophical systems, scientific frameworks, and religious traditions. The term is used in a technical sense, rather than as a reference to personal identity or ideology.

Five domains are used as a starting point for evaluation:

- Predictive capacity (forward constraint)
- Anomalous data (boundary conditions)
- Knowledge production (internal generativity)
- Macro-historical impact (long-term stability)
- Experiential coherence (human-level alignment)

These domains are not assumed to be exhaustive, but are selected to represent distinct ways in which systems interact with reality.

Each domain is evaluated independently. The key insight emerges when these evaluations are considered together.

When a system maintains alignment across multiple domains simultaneously, a pattern of convergence appears. This convergence reduces the ability to interpret each domain in isolation and shifts evaluation toward system-level performance.

This framework operates on two levels:

The evaluative layer identifies convergence across domains.

The structural layer considers what conditions may underlie that convergence, including potential constraints on admissibility, inference, and observation.

The diagram that follows provides a visual representation of how these components relate to one another. The sections that follow develop each part of the framework in detail.

This work does not attempt to prove any particular system. Its aim is to provide a structured method for comparing how different systems perform when evaluated across the full range of their interaction with reality.

WEP Architecture Overview

The overall structure of WEP can be represented as a layered system, where domain-level evaluation produces convergence, and convergence is subsequently interpreted at a structural level.

Figure: The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) architecture. The evaluative layer identifies convergence across independent domains, while the structural layer interprets convergence as a potential indicator of shared constraints across those domains.

Methodology: A Multi-Domain Convergence Framework

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) operates as a structured comparative framework designed to assess how competing worldviews interact with reality across multiple independent domains. Its methodology is grounded in three core principles: domain independence, standardized evaluation, and convergent integration.

WEP operates across two levels: an evaluative layer, which identifies convergence across independent domains, and a structural layer, which considers what conditions may underlie that convergence.

1. Domain Independence

Each domain within WEP represents a distinct category of interaction between a worldview and reality. These domains are selected to minimize conceptual overlap and to capture fundamentally different types of data and explanatory demands. The five primary domains are:

- Predictive Power (PCCRI)
- Anomalous Events (AEI / MDCRI / SRCRI)
- Knowledge Production Capacity (IDCRI)
- Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)
- Experiential Coherence (ECRI)

These domains are not treated as interchangeable. Each operates under its own evidentiary standards, methodological constraints, and interpretive frameworks. This separation is essential to prevent circular reasoning, where conclusions in one domain are assumed within another.

2. Standardized Evaluation Criteria

Within each domain, evaluation is conducted using a consistent set of

normalized variables. These variables are defined in relation to the domain's specific criteria (e.g., specificity, duration, explanatory gap, institutional depth), and are scaled between 0 and 1 to allow comparability.

The purpose of normalization is not to claim precise measurement, but to enable structured comparison. Scores are understood as relative indicators rather than absolute values. This approach reflects the inherent complexity of the domains involved, many of which incorporate historical, philosophical, or experiential data that resist exact quantification.

Each domain produces an index representing the relative strength of a worldview within that domain. These indices are expressed both as scalar values and, where appropriate, as order-of-magnitude approximations to reflect rarity.

3. Convergent Integration

The defining feature of WEP is its use of convergence rather than isolated evaluation. Domain-specific indices are not interpreted independently, but are integrated through a multiplicative structure:

$$WEP \approx PCCRI \times AEI \times IDCRI \times HIRI \times ECRI$$

This structure reflects the principle that alignment across independent domains is progressively more difficult to achieve through unrelated mechanisms. As additional domains converge, the combined explanatory burden increases.

Importantly, this is not a probabilistic claim in the strict statistical sense. The multiplicative model functions as a heuristic representation of convergence, capturing the intuition that independent alignment carries greater significance than isolated success.

4. Interpretation Framework

WEP does not interpret results as definitive proof. Instead, it evaluates relative coherence across domains. Higher convergence indicates that a worldview maintains alignment across multiple independent dimensions of reality, while lower convergence suggests fragmentation or domain-specific limitation.

The framework is designed to remain open to revision. Changes in data, reinterpretation of evidence, or refinement of domain criteria may alter individual scores. However, the structural approach—evaluating systems through multi-domain convergence—remains constant.

5. Limitations and Constraints

Several constraints are explicitly acknowledged:

- Domain evaluations may depend on interpretive assumptions
- Data availability varies across domains
- Some variables (e.g., experiential coherence) are inherently resistant to precise measurement
- The model relies on comparative, not absolute, evaluation

These limitations do not invalidate the framework, but define its scope. WEP is not intended to eliminate uncertainty, but to organize it within a consistent evaluative structure.

6. Replicability and Transparency

To ensure methodological transparency, WEP follows a repeatable process:

1. Define domain-specific datasets
2. Apply standardized evaluation criteria

3. Normalize variables (0–1 scale)
4. Compute domain indices
5. Integrate indices through convergence model
6. Document assumptions and interpretive choices

This allows independent researchers to reproduce the analysis, adjust parameters, and test alternative interpretations.

7. Interpretation Constraint

The scoring outputs generated within WEP represent structured comparisons under defined domain criteria.

They should not be interpreted as:

- direct measures of truth
- final rankings of worldview validity
- or conclusive determinations of explanatory supremacy

Instead, they function as:

- comparative indicators within a specified evaluative framework
- sensitivity-dependent outputs that may vary with alternative assumptions
- provisional representations of convergence across domains

The interpretive force of these scores depends on:

- the transparency of variable definitions
- the consistency of scoring application
- and the robustness of the underlying datasets

Accordingly, WEP distinguishes between:

- numerical output (what is measured)
- and interpretive conclusion (what is inferred)

This distinction is maintained throughout the framework to preserve methodological clarity.

The methodology establishes WEP not as a single argument, but as a framework for structured comparison. Its validity does not depend on any individual conclusion, but on whether the process of multi-domain evaluation provides a clearer account of how worldviews align with reality.

The following sections apply this framework across the defined domains.

Formalizing Convergence

Within the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP), convergence refers to the alignment of independent domains under a shared explanatory framework. However, not all alignment is equally significant. A distinction must therefore be made between trivial and non-trivial convergence.

Trivial convergence occurs when alignment across domains can be reasonably explained by shared background assumptions, methodological overlap, or low constraint conditions. In such cases, convergence does not meaningfully reduce interpretive flexibility.

Non-trivial convergence occurs when multiple domains—each governed by distinct evaluative criteria—simultaneously align in a way that would be unlikely under independent variation. In this case, convergence functions as a constraint on interpretation.

This can be expressed formally:

Let $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ represent distinct domains.

Let $P(D_i \mid S)$ represent the degree to which a system S satisfies the evaluative criteria of domain D_i.

Convergence can then be modeled as a function:

$$C(S) = \Pi\, P(D_i \mid S)$$

Where convergence increases as a system satisfies multiple domains simultaneously.

The significance of convergence is not determined by any single domain score, but by the combined constraint imposed by their joint satisfaction.

As additional domains are satisfied, the space of plausible alternative explanations decreases. This produces an effect analogous to constraint accumulation, where each domain reduces the degrees of freedom available to competing systems.

Importantly, this formulation is heuristic rather than probabilistic. The values assigned to $P(D_i \mid S)$ are not strict probabilities, but structured indicators of domain performance.

The key implication is this:

Convergence becomes meaningful when the joint satisfaction of multiple methodologically distinct domains exceeds what would be expected under independent or loosely constrained conditions.

This threshold—where convergence transitions from trivial to non-trivial—marks the point at which alignment across domains begins to function as a significant evaluative constraint.

Worked Example: Christianity and Naturalism

To illustrate how convergence operates within the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP), this section provides a simplified comparative example between two broad explanatory systems: Christianity and Naturalism.

The purpose of this example is not to establish definitive conclusions, but to demonstrate how cross-domain evaluation functions when applied to competing frameworks.

Each system is assessed across five domains:

D_1: Predictive Capacity
D_2: Anomalous Data
D_3: Knowledge Production
D_4: Macro-Historical Impact
D_5: Experiential Coherence

Scores are assigned heuristically on a normalized scale between 0 and 1, representing the degree to which each system satisfies the evaluative criteria of a given domain.

Domain Assessment

Christianity

- D_1 (Predictive Capacity): 0.65
- D_2 (Anomalous Data): 0.80
- D_3 (Knowledge Production): 0.70
- D_4 (Macro-Historical Impact): 0.85
- D_5 (Experiential Coherence): 0.80

Naturalism

- D_1 (Predictive Capacity): 0.90
- D_2 (Anomalous Data): 0.40
- D_3 (Knowledge Production): 0.85
- D_4 (Macro-Historical Impact): 0.75
- D_5 (Experiential Coherence): 0.50

Convergence Calculation

Using the convergence function:

$C(S) = \prod P(D_i \mid S)$

Christianity

$C(C) = 0.65 \times 0.80 \times 0.70 \times 0.85 \times 0.80 \approx 0.247$

Naturalism

$C(N) = 0.90 \times 0.40 \times 0.85 \times 0.75 \times 0.50 \approx 0.115$

Interpretation

Although Naturalism demonstrates strong performance in predictive capacity and knowledge production, its lower alignment in anomalous data and experiential coherence reduces its overall convergence.

Christianity, while not maximizing any single domain, maintains relatively consistent performance across all domains. This produces a higher overall convergence score.

Within WEP, this illustrates a key principle:

Convergence is not determined by peak performance in isolated domains,

but by the ability to sustain alignment across multiple domains simultaneously.

Structural Implication

From the perspective of the structural layer, the observed convergence raises an additional question:

What underlying constraints would allow a system to maintain alignment across predictive, anomalous, intellectual, historical, and experiential domains simultaneously?

The example does not resolve this question. However, it demonstrates how convergence functions as an indicator that multiple domains may be responding to a shared explanatory structure.

Clarification

This example is illustrative and heuristic.

- The assigned values are not empirical measurements
- Different evaluators may assign different weights
- The purpose is to demonstrate the mechanics of convergence, not to produce final conclusions

The significance of the example lies in showing how cross-domain alignment, rather than isolated domain strength, affects overall evaluation within the WEP framework.

Worked Example: Transparent Multi-Domain Evaluation

To demonstrate the operational structure of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP), this section provides a fully transparent, step-by-step example of how a worldview may be evaluated across multiple independent domains.

This example is not intended to produce a definitive conclusion, but to illustrate how the framework functions when applied to real categories of data.

Step 1: Define the Domains

For this example, five domains are used:

- Predictive Capacity (P)
- Anomalous Data (A)
- Knowledge Production (K)
- Historical Impact (H)
- Experiential Coherence (E)

Each domain is treated as independent and non-reducible.

Step 2: Establish Scoring Criteria

Each domain is evaluated on a normalized scale from 0 to 1, where:

- 0.0 = no alignment with observed reality
- 0.5 = partial or ambiguous alignment
- 1.0 = strong, consistent alignment

Scores are assigned based on publicly accessible categories of evidence within each domain.

Step 3: Assign Domain Scores (Illustrative Case)

For demonstration purposes, consider the following hypothetical scoring:

- P = 0.82
- A = 0.76
- K = 0.88
- H = 0.91
- E = 0.79

These values represent relative performance within each domain based on:

- predictive reliability
- density of anomalous reports
- contribution to knowledge systems
- macro-historical influence
- internal experiential coherence

Step 4: Apply the Convergence Model

WEP evaluates convergence through multiplicative integration:

$$\text{WEP Score} = P \times A \times K \times H \times E$$

Substituting values:

$$\text{WEP Score} = 0.82 \times 0.76 \times 0.88 \times 0.91 \times 0.79$$

$$\text{WEP Score} \approx 0.39$$

Step 5: Interpret the Result

The resulting value (0.39) is not interpreted in isolation, but in relation to:

- alternative worldview scores
- expected baseline distributions
- sensitivity to domain variation

The key observation is not the magnitude alone, but the sustained alignment across independent domains required to produce the result.

Step 6: Sensitivity Analysis

To illustrate the importance of convergence, consider a reduction in one domain:

If:

A decreases from 0.76 to 0.30

Then:

WEP Score = $0.82 \times 0.30 \times 0.88 \times 0.91 \times 0.79$

WEP Score ≈ 0.16

A single domain collapse significantly reduces the overall score.

Step 7: Implication

This demonstrates a key property of the WEP model:

High overall performance requires consistent strength across multiple

independent domains.

No single domain can compensate for systemic weakness in others.

Step 8: Structural Insight

The worked example illustrates that:

- The model does not reward isolated excellence
- It penalizes inconsistency across domains
- It highlights systems that maintain cross-domain coherence

This reinforces the central principle of the framework:

Convergence across independent domains functions as a constraint on plausible explanations of reality.

Step 9: Limitations of the Example

This example is illustrative and does not represent a finalized empirical evaluation.

- Domain scores remain subject to refinement
- Data selection must be transparent and replicable
- Alternative weighting models may be explored

The purpose of this section is methodological clarity, not final adjudication.

Step 10: Forward Extension

Future work may extend this model through dataset-driven scoring and cross-system comparison at scale.

The Structural Layer: Interpreting Convergence

Having established how convergence is identified within the evaluative layer of WEP, this section considers how that convergence may be understood at a structural level.

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is designed to operate at the level of evaluation. It identifies when independent domains align under a shared explanatory framework and treats that alignment—convergence—as a constraint on interpretation.

However, the presence of convergence raises a deeper question:

What conditions make convergence possible across independent domains?

Within WEP, convergence is treated as an empirical observation. Multiple domains—each governed by different forms of data, methods, and evaluative criteria—are assessed independently. When these domains begin to align, the framework identifies this as a meaningful feature.

Yet convergence is not self-explanatory.

Its occurrence suggests that something is operating across domains in a consistent way.

One possible interpretation is that convergence arises from underlying structural constraints that shape how systems define admissibility, inference, and observation. In this view, domains do not converge simply by coincidence or accumulation of evidence, but because they are operating within compatible constraints that limit what counts as a viable explanation.

From this perspective, convergence can be understood in two layers:

As an evaluative signal:

the observable alignment of independent domains under a shared framework.

As a structural indicator:

evidence that multiple domains are being constrained in a consistent manner.

This distinction does not alter the function of WEP as an evaluative system. Rather, it extends its interpretive scope.

WEP does not attempt to fully specify the nature of these underlying constraints. It remains methodologically focused on identifying when convergence occurs and how it affects interpretive flexibility.

However, recognizing the possibility of a structural layer clarifies an important point:

Convergence is not merely the accumulation of agreement across domains. It is an indication that multiple independent domains may be responding to shared constraints that limit the range of admissible explanations.

In this sense, the presence of convergence shifts the question.

It is no longer only:

Do these domains align?

But also:

What makes their alignment possible?

This reframing does not resolve the question of truth. It relocates it.

From isolated evaluation of individual domains

to the structural conditions under which convergence emerges.

This interpretation does not replace the evaluative function of WEP, but clarifies that convergence may reflect not only agreement across domains, but the presence of constraints operating across them.

2

Domain 1: Predictive Power (PCCRI)

1. Definition of Predictive Power

Within WEP, the Prophetic Credibility Rarity Index (PCCRI) is defined as the degree to which a worldview demonstrates the capacity to generate specific, testable, and temporally prior predictive claims that are later interpreted as fulfilled.

This includes:

- long-range predictions
- specificity and precision
- independence from fulfillment conditions
- post-event verifiability

2. Evaluation Criteria

2.1 Specificity

- Are predictions general or highly detailed?

2.2 Temporal Distance

- How far in advance are predictions made?

2.3 Independence

- Are outcomes subject to direct influence or self-fulfillment?

2.4 Verification

- Is there historical or empirical confirmation?

2.5 Scoring Anchors

Score | Criteria
0–2 | No predictive structure present
3–4 | Broad or symbolic predictive claims
5–6 | Some specific predictions with limited verification
7–8 | Multiple specific predictions with independent alignment
9–10 | Highly specific, long-range predictions with strong independent verification

3. Christianity — Predictive Dataset

3.1 Core Claim

Christianity includes predictive elements (commonly referred to as prophecy) that are:

- temporally prior to reported fulfillment
- textually preserved
- interpreted as historically realized within the tradition

3.2 Evidence Categories

A. Messianic Prophecies

- Predictive claims concerning a future figure with defined attributes

B. National / Historical Predictions

- Forecasts regarding nations, cities, and historical developments

C. Textual Preservation

- Manuscript traditions preserving predictive claims prior to their interpreted fulfillment

3.3 Strengths

- High volume of predictive claims
- Presence of cases with notable specificity
- Strong manuscript preservation traditions

3.4 Weaknesses / Criticisms

- Disputes regarding textual dating
- Interpretive differences concerning fulfillment
- Potential for partial or indirect self-fulfillment in certain cases

3.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Manuscripts and historical records
- **Tier 2:** Scholarly analysis
- **Tier 3:** Theological interpretation

3.6 Provisional Score

- Specificity: Moderate–High
- Temporal distance: Moderate–High
- Independence: Mixed
- Verification: Contested

Final Range: 7.0 – 9.0

4. Naturalism — Predictive Dataset

4.1 Core Claim

Naturalistic frameworks emphasize predictive capacity through:

- scientific modeling
- empirical observation
- repeatable and testable forecasting systems

These predictive structures are generally:

- short- to medium-term
- dependent on existing data
- expressed in probabilistic or model-based form

4.2 Evidence Categories

A. Scientific Prediction

- Derived from laws, models, and repeatable experimentation

B. Technological Forecasting

- Engineering projections and applied science outcomes

4.3 Strengths

- High accuracy in short-term predictive contexts
- Strong empirical verification standards
- Emphasis on repeatability and refinement

4.4 Weaknesses

- Limited emphasis on long-range, singular predictive claims independent of existing data
- Reliance on probabilistic modeling rather than discrete future-specific claims
- Dependence on prior observational frameworks

4.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Experimental data
- **Tier 2:** Scientific literature
- **Tier 3:** Philosophical interpretation

4.6 Provisional Score

- Specificity: High (short-term context)
- Temporal distance: Low
- Independence: High
- Verification: High

Final Range: 2.0 – 4.0

5. Comparative Analysis

- Criterion | Christianity | Naturalism
- Specificity | High | Moderate

- Temporal Distance | High | Low
- Independence | Mixed | High
- Verification | Contested | High

6. Midpoint Scoring

- Christianity ≈ 8.0
- Naturalism ≈ 3.0

7. Interpretation

Within WEP criteria:

- Christianity exhibits a predictive structure that includes long-range and singular claims interpreted as fulfilled within its framework
- Naturalistic systems exhibit strong predictive performance in short-term and repeatable contexts, with less emphasis on long-range singular predictive claims

These differences reflect **distinct predictive structures**, rather than direct determinations of explanatory validity.

8. Critical Sensitivity Note

This domain is sensitive to:

- assumptions regarding textual dating
- interpretive frameworks for fulfillment
- definitions of "prediction" versus "projection"

Accordingly, results should be interpreted as comparisons of predictive structure, not as definitive proof of predictive accuracy.

9. Domain Insight (Structural Takeaway)

This domain highlights a structural distinction:

- some worldviews include long-range, singular predictive structures
- others emphasize iterative, model-based forecasting grounded in existing data

This represents a difference in the **type of prediction**, not solely in predictive accuracy:

singular long-range claims vs repeatable short-range projections

10. WEP Interpretation Layer

Within WEP, Predictive Power contributes to overall evaluation by:

- assessing whether a worldview can extend beyond present data constraints
- measuring the rarity of accurate long-range specificity
- distinguishing between predictive success that is:

1. structurally embedded
2. or methodologically derived

11. Limitations of the Domain

To maintain neutrality, several constraints must be acknowledged:

- predictive claims are often interpretation-dependent
- historical verification may be incomplete or disputed
- different disciplines define "prediction" differently

(e.g., theology, physics, statistics)

12. Integration into Convergence Model

Within the full WEP system:

- PCCRI does not function independently
- its significance emerges when integrated with:

1. historical alignment
2. experiential coherence
3. knowledge production
4. macro-scale impact

13. Final Domain Summary

Predictive Power (PCCRI) measures:

the presence and structure of forward-looking claims that precede their interpreted outcomes

In this domain:

- Christianity scores higher due to:

inclusion of long-range predictive structures

- Naturalism scores lower due to:

emphasis on model-based, data-dependent predictive systems

However:

this distinction is domain-specific and must be interpreted within the full multi-domain convergence framework

14. PCCRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To express PCCRI in a simplified quantitative form:

Let:

- S = Specificity factor
- T = Temporal distance factor
- I = Independence factor
- V = Verification strength

Then:

$PCCRI \approx (S \times T \times I \times V)$

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

14.1 Interpretation

- Higher values → greater structural presence of specific, temporally prior predictive claims
- Lower values → reduced presence or reliance on such predictive structures

15. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To align with WEP's convergence framework:

- High PCCRI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate PCCRI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}

- Low PCCRI → ~10^{-5} or lower

16. Example Application (Illustrative)

Christianity (Illustrative Only)

- S ≈ 0.8
- T ≈ 0.7
- I ≈ 0.6
- V ≈ 0.7

PCCRI ≈ 0.8 × 0.7 × 0.6 × 0.7 ≈ 0.235

→ Approximate magnitude: ~10^{-1}

Naturalism (Illustrative Only)

- S ≈ 0.5 (primarily short-term predictive context)
- T ≈ 0.2
- I ≈ 0.9
- V ≈ 0.9

PCCRI ≈ 0.5 × 0.2 × 0.9 × 0.9 ≈ 0.081

→ Approximate magnitude: ~10^{-2} to 10^{-3}

17. Important Clarification

These values are:

- illustrative, not definitive
- dependent on:

1. dataset selection
2. weighting choices
3. interpretation of evidence

They are intended to demonstrate model behavior under defined assumptions.

18. Structural Insight

The primary output of PCCRI is not the exact numerical value, but:

the relative positioning of worldviews under consistent evaluative criteria

This allows for comparison of predictive structures without requiring identical predictive mechanisms.

19. Integration into Full Convergence Equation

PCCRI functions as one component within the broader WEP model:

Convergence Magnitude ≈

PCCRI × MDCRI × IDCRI × HIRI × ECRI

Adjusted by:

Seven Principles Multiplier (0–1.0)

Its contribution is evaluated in conjunction with other domains rather than in isolation.

20. Final Technical Summary

PCCRI operationalizes predictive structures into:

- a measurable framework
- a comparable index
- a scalable input for cross-domain evaluation

This allows predictive claims to be assessed as part of a unified analytical system rather than as isolated arguments.

21. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

To maintain methodological rigor, PCCRI must be evaluated against its strongest objections.

21.1 Post Hoc Interpretation Objection

Claim:

Predictive "fulfillments" may be interpreted after the fact and not reflect original intent.

Response (WEP Framing):

- Addressed through:

1. Specificity (S)
2. Independence (I)

Less precise or retrospectively aligned interpretations result in lower scores rather than exclusion.

21.2 Self-Fulfillment Objection

Claim:

Predictions may be fulfilled by agents aware of them.

Response:

- Addressed within Independence (I)
- Events with high controllability receive reduced weighting

21.3 Textual Dating Dispute

Claim:

Predictive texts may postdate the events they describe.

Response:

- Addressed within Verification (V)
- Emphasizes:

1. independent manuscript attestation
2. pre-event dating where available

Events with uncertain or disputed dating are proportionally weighted lower within the model.

21.4 Selection Bias

Claim:

Only "successful" predictions are highlighted, while non-aligning cases are excluded.

Response:

- Full PCCRI implementation requires:

1. evaluation of the complete prediction dataset
2. inclusion of both aligning and non-aligning cases

This shifts PCCRI from anecdotal selection toward dataset-level analysis.

21.5 Category Error Objection

Claim:

Comparing prophetic prediction with scientific prediction is invalid due to differing domains.

Response:

- WEP distinguishes between:

1. long-range, singular predictive structures
2. short-range, repeatable predictive models

PCCRI evaluates differences in predictive structure rather than assuming identical predictive mechanisms.

22. Robustness Conditions

For PCCRI to remain methodologically valid:

- scoring criteria must be applied consistently across worldviews
- data selection must be transparent
- clear distinction must be maintained between:

1. observed data
2. interpretive frameworks

23. Replicability Protocol

To support reproducibility:

1. define the prediction dataset
2. assign S, T, I, V values independently
3. compute PCCRI
4. compare across worldviews
5. document assumptions explicitly

Independent applications should produce comparable ranges under similar assumptions.

24. Domain Boundary Clarification

PCCRI does not evaluate:

- the truth of theological claims
- the moral value of a worldview
- experiential or existential validity

It evaluates only:

the presence and structure of predictive claims within a system.

25. Final Domain Position

Within WEP:

- PCCRI functions as a forward-oriented domain evaluating predictive

structure
- it provides one dimension of alignment within a multi-domain system

Its interpretive significance emerges only when integrated with independently assessed domains.

26. Transition to Next Domain

Where PCCRI evaluates predictive structure prior to events, the next domain evaluates:

events that occur without prior predictive expectation

This leads to:

Domain 2 — Anomalous Event Integration (MDCRI / SRCRI)

where the framework shifts from:

→ forward prediction

to:

→ interpretation of unexpected or low-frequency events

3

Domain 2: Anomalous Event Integration (AEI)

1. Definition of Anomalous Events

Within WEP, this domain evaluates the occurrence, documentation, and explanatory treatment of events that appear to deviate from commonly expected natural patterns.

This domain does not attempt to determine whether such events ultimately have natural or non-natural causes. Instead, it evaluates how different world-views interpret, document, and integrate reports of anomalous phenomena.

This evaluation is operationalized through two indices:

- **MDCRI** — Miracle Documentation Credibility Rarity Index
- **SRCRI** — Supernatural Reports Credibility Rarity Index

2. Domain Scope

This domain includes reported events such as:

- medically or scientifically unusual recoveries
- events lacking clear or widely accepted natural explanations
- first-person and third-party reports of supernatural or transcendent phenomena
- cross-cultural accounts of anomalous experiences

The focus of this domain is not the ultimate explanation of such events, but the **structural treatment of anomalous reports within competing worldviews**.

3. Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Documentation Quality

- Are events recorded with credible forms of evidence?

3.2 Corroboration

- Are there multiple independent witnesses or sources?

3.3 Explanatory Gap

- Does the event remain resistant to currently available conventional explanations?

3.4 Replicability Constraint

- Is the event non-repeatable but still documented with sufficient supporting evidence?

3.5 Scoring Anchors

- Score | Criteria

- 0–2 | No anomalous events or phenomena consistently explained through conventional mechanisms
- 3–4 | Weak or largely anecdotal reports
- 5–6 | Moderate documentation with unresolved explanatory elements
- 7–8 | Strong documentation with significant explanatory gaps
- 9–10 | Highly corroborated and well-documented anomalies that remain resistant to widely accepted explanation

4. Christianity — Anomalous Events Dataset

4.1 Core Claim

Christianity includes a long historical and contemporary record of events interpreted within its tradition as:

- miracles
- extraordinary healings
- supernatural or transcendent encounters

Within this worldview, such reports are typically interpreted as meaningful occurrences that may involve non-material causal dimensions.

4.2 Evidence Categories

A. Historical Miracle Claims

- Early textual accounts describing extraordinary events

B. Modern Medical Anomalies

- Documented recoveries reported as lacking conventional medical explanation

C. Eyewitness Testimonies

- Reports from multiple individuals across different cultural contexts

D. Institutional Investigations

- Formal evaluation procedures within some religious institutions

4.3 Strengths

- High volume of reports across historical periods
- Global geographic distribution
- Presence of some medically investigated cases
- Existence of structured evaluation processes in certain contexts

4.4 Weaknesses / Criticisms

A. Naturalistic Explanations

- Misdiagnosis
- Spontaneous remission
- Psychological or psychosomatic factors

B. Verification Challenges

- Many cases lack controlled experimental conditions

C. Reporting Bias

- Tendency for positive or extraordinary cases to receive disproportionate attention

4.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:**
- Medical documentation
- Eyewitness accounts
- **Tier 2:**
- Case studies
- **Tier 3:**
- Interpretive frameworks

4.6 Provisional Score

- Documentation: Moderate–High
- Corroboration: Moderate
- Explanatory gap: Moderate–High
- Replicability: Low (inherent to many anomalous claims)

Final Range: 6.5 – 8.5

5. Naturalism — Anomalous Events Dataset

5.1 Core Claim

Naturalistic frameworks generally interpret anomalous events through extensions of existing natural explanations. Reports that initially appear unusual are typically treated as:

- currently unexplained natural phenomena
- statistical outliers
- perceptual or cognitive errors
- or events awaiting future scientific clarification

5.2 Evidence Categories

A. Scientific Reinterpretation

- Reclassification of anomalous events as solvable scientific problems

B. Psychological and Neurological Models

- Hallucinations
- Cognitive biases
- Perceptual distortions

5.3 Strengths

- Strong commitment to explanatory consistency
- Integration with established scientific methodology
- Continuous effort to reduce unexplained phenomena through investigation

5.4 Weaknesses

A. Explanatory Deferral

- Some events remain unexplained but are provisionally assumed to have natural causes

B. Dismissal Risk

- Potential for premature rejection of anomalous reports

C. Limited Accommodation

- Anomalous events are typically interpreted within existing natural frameworks rather than treated as indicators of fundamentally different causal categories

5.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:**
- Scientific literature
- **Tier 2:**
- Psychology and neuroscience research
- **Tier 3:**
- Philosophical interpretation

5.6 Provisional Score

- Documentation: High (through systematic reinterpretation and investigation)
- Corroboration: High (methodological standards)
- Explanatory gap: Low (events typically reframed within natural processes)
- Replicability: High (repeatability strongly emphasized)

Final Range: 2.0 – 4.5

6. Comparative Analysis

- Criterion | Christianity | Naturalism
- Documentation | Moderate–High | High
- Corroboration | Moderate | High
- Explanatory Gap | High | Low
- Replicability | Low | High

7. Midpoint Scoring

- Christianity ≈ 7.5
- Naturalism ≈ 3.5

8. Interpretation

Within WEP criteria:

- Christianity tends to retain anomalous events as potentially meaningful data that may require expanded explanatory frameworks.
- Naturalistic systems tend to reinterpret anomalous events within existing natural explanatory structures.

These differences reflect **distinct interpretive strategies rather than direct determinations of causal reality**.

9. Critical Sensitivity Note

This domain is highly sensitive to:

- standards of evidence
- definitions of "miracle" or anomalous event
- thresholds for explanatory adequacy

Accordingly, the results reflect differences in **interpretive openness and explanatory strategy**, rather than definitive conclusions about causation.

10. Domain Insight (Structural Takeaway)

This domain highlights a structural distinction in how worldviews respond to anomalous reports:

Some systems preserve anomalies as signals that may indicate the need for expanded explanatory frameworks, while others interpret such reports within established natural models.

The evaluation focuses on **interpretive structure**, not on adjudicating the ultimate nature of the events themselves.

11. Transition Forward

Where Domain 2 evaluates:

→ the treatment of events that appear to deviate from expected patterns

The next domain evaluates:

→ the capacity of a worldview to generate structured knowledge from observed reality

12. MDCRI / SRCRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To operationalize anomalous event integration within WEP, this domain is expressed through two components:

- **MDCRI —** Miracle Documentation Credibility Rarity Index
- **SRCRI —** Supernatural Reports Credibility Rarity Index

12.1 Variable Definitions

Let:

- D = Documentation quality
- C = Corroboration strength
- E = Explanatory gap (degree to which events remain resistant to currently available explanations)
- R = Replicability constraint (inverted: non-replicable but well-attested events receive higher weighting)

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

12.2 Core Equations

1. MDCRI ≈ (D × C × E × R)
2. SRCRI ≈ (D × C × E)

Combined Anomalous Event Index:

AEI ≈ (MDCRI + SRCRI) / 2

13. Interpretation

- Higher values → Greater retention and integration of anomalous reports within the worldview, supported by documentation and corroboration
- Lower values → Greater tendency to reinterpret anomalous reports within existing explanatory frameworks, or reduced emphasis on anomaly classification

These values reflect **structural differences in how anomalous events are processed**, not determinations of the underlying causes of the events themselves.

14. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To align with WEP:

- High AEI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate AEI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}
- Low AEI → ~10^{-5} or lower

15. Example Application (Illustrative)
Christianity

- D ≈ 0.7
- C ≈ 0.6
- E ≈ 0.7

- $R \approx 0.8$

1. MDCRI $\approx 0.7 \times 0.6 \times 0.7 \times 0.8 \approx 0.235$
2. SRCRI $\approx 0.7 \times 0.6 \times 0.7 \approx 0.294$
3. AEI $\approx (0.235 + 0.294) / 2 \approx 0.264$

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-1}$

Naturalism

- $D \approx 0.8$
- $C \approx 0.8$
- $E \approx 0.2$
- $R \approx 0.2$

1. MDCRI $\approx 0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.2 \times 0.2 \approx 0.0256$
2. SRCRI $\approx 0.8 \times 0.8 \times 0.2 \approx 0.128$
3. AEI $\approx (0.0256 + 0.128) / 2 \approx 0.0768$

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-2}$ to 10^{-3}

16. Important Clarification

These values are:

- Illustrative only
- Dependent on:

1. Case selection
2. Documentation standards
3. Interpretive thresholds

They are intended to demonstrate how the model operates, not to provide

fixed or final measurements.

17. Structural Insight

The key distinction revealed by AEI is:

whether a worldview primarily:

- retains anomalous reports as data requiring expanded or alternative explanatory frameworks

or

- interprets such reports within existing explanatory structures, reducing the need to classify them as fundamentally anomalous

This distinction reflects differences in **interpretive orientation**, not conclusions about the events themselves.

18. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

18.1 "Gap-Based Explanation" Objection

Claim:

Anomalies represent gaps in current knowledge rather than indicators of alternative explanatory categories.

Response:

- Addressed through E (Explanatory Gap)
- As explanatory coverage increases over time:

→ AEI values adjust accordingly

The model is structured to remain responsive to changes in available explanations.

18.2 Misdiagnosis / Error Objection

Claim:

Anomalous reports may result from incomplete or incorrect data.

Response:

- Addressed through:

1. D (Documentation)
2. C (Corroboration)

Lower-quality cases are weighted accordingly within the model.

18.3 Non-Replicability Objection

Claim:

Events that cannot be repeated lack scientific validity.

Response:

- WEP distinguishes between:

1. Experimental repeatability
2. Historical event analysis

Non-replicable events may still be evaluated based on documentation and corroboration.

18.4 Cultural Projection Objection

Claim:
Anomalous reports reflect cultural or psychological expectations.

Response:

- Addressed through cross-cultural comparison within SRCRI
- Recurring patterns across independent contexts are incorporated into the evaluation

18.5 Selection Bias Objection

Claim:

Only extraordinary or favorable cases are considered.

Response:

- Full implementation requires:

1. Inclusion of complete datasets
2. Consideration of null or non-confirming cases

19. Robustness Conditions

For AEI to remain valid:

- Consistent evidentiary standards must be applied
- Case selection must be transparent

- A clear distinction must be maintained between:

1. event description
2. interpretive classification

20. Replicability Protocol

1. Define anomaly dataset
2. Score D, C, E, R independently
3. Compute MDCRI and SRCRI
4. Combine into AEI
5. Compare across worldviews

This process ensures that evaluation remains structured, transparent, and reproducible within the framework.

21. Domain Boundary Clarification

This domain does not determine:

- whether an event is ultimately supernatural
- the definitive cause of anomalous phenomena

It evaluates:

the manner in which anomalous data is interpreted, retained, and integrated within a given worldview

22. Final Domain Summary

Anomalous Events (MDCRI / SRCRI) measure:

how a worldview processes unexpected or difficult-to-explain phenomena

In this domain:

- Christianity scores higher due to:

◦ greater retention and integration of anomalous reports within its explanatory framework

- Naturalism scores lower due to:

◦ a stronger tendency to interpret such events within existing explanatory models

These differences reflect **distinct interpretive strategies**, not conclusions about the underlying nature of the events.

23. Integration into Convergence Model

AEI contributes to WEP by:

- evaluating how a system engages with non-routine or low-frequency data
- measuring the relative persistence of unexplained but documented phenomena within a worldview

It functions as:

a complementary domain to predictive and mechanistic models, introducing sensitivity to irregular or boundary-case data

24. Transition to Next Domain

Where Domain 2 evaluates:

→ anomalous or unexpected phenomena

The next domain evaluates:

→ the capacity to generate structured knowledge from observed reality

25. Domain-Level Synthesis (Meta Interpretation)

When fully developed, the Anomalous Events domain highlights a structural distinction:

- some worldviews prioritize maintaining explanatory continuity within established frameworks
- others allow for the incorporation of events that extend beyond currently established explanatory boundaries

This distinction is not limited to specific claims about miracles.

It reflects broader differences in:

the range of explanatory categories a worldview is prepared to employ

26. Pattern-Level Observation

Across evaluated datasets, a recurring pattern emerges:

- higher AEI values tend to correlate with:

1. greater tolerance for unresolved or low-frequency phenomena
2. broader interpretive flexibility

- lower AEI values tend to correlate with:

1. stronger emphasis on methodological consistency
2. a tendency to reinterpret anomalies within existing explanatory structures

27. Cross-Domain Interaction

AEI operates in conjunction with other domains:

- with PCCRI (Predictive Power):

→ evaluates whether anomalous events align with or diverge from prior expectations

- with HIRI (Macro-Historical Impact):

→ considers whether anomalous events influence large-scale historical or social systems

- with ECRI (Experiential Coherence):

→ connects anomalous reports to patterns of human experience

28. Risk of Misinterpretation

Without proper framing, this domain may be misunderstood as:

- a validation of specific supernatural claims
- a rejection of scientific reasoning

WEP explicitly avoids both interpretations.

Instead, AEI evaluates:

how different systems process anomalous information, not whether such events are ultimately confirmed or explained

29. Calibration Requirement

To maintain rigor, AEI must be calibrated using:

- control datasets (including false positives and re-evaluated cases)
- cross-cultural comparisons
- independent verification standards

30. Structural Role Within WEP

AEI functions as:

a boundary-condition domain within the framework

It evaluates whether a worldview can:

- engage with edge-case or low-frequency data
- accommodate unresolved phenomena
- maintain internal coherence under conditions of uncertainty

31. Final Technical Position

Within the full WEP framework:

- AEI introduces non-linear or irregular data points
- PCCRI introduces forward-oriented predictive structure

Together, they form:

a dual-axis evaluation of expectation and deviation

32. Transition to Domain 3

With Domains 1 and 2 complete, WEP has evaluated:

- forward-oriented structure (prediction)
- deviation from expectation (anomalous events)

The next domain evaluates:

the capacity to systematically generate and organize knowledge from observed reality

4

Domain 3: Knowledge Production Capacity (IDCRI)

1. Definition of Knowledge Production Capacity

Within WEP, the Intellectual Documentation Credibility Rarity Index (IDCRI) is defined as:

the degree to which a worldview contributes to the generation, preservation, and organization of systems of knowledge, including science, philosophy, mathematics, and institutional learning.

2. Domain Scope

This domain includes:

- scientific discovery and methodological development
- philosophical systems and reasoning frameworks
- educational and research institutions
- technological advancement
- long-term intellectual influence

The focus is on **structured knowledge generation and sustained intellectual development across time, rather than isolated contributions.

3. Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Foundational Contribution

- To what extent does the worldview contribute to the emergence of major knowledge systems?

3.2 Sustained Output

- Does it support continued knowledge production across historical periods?

3.3 Institutional Development

- Does it contribute to the formation or support of knowledge-generating institutions?

3.4 Epistemic Compatibility

- Is the worldview compatible with, or supportive of, rational inquiry and investigation?

3.5 Scoring Anchors

- Score | Criteria
- 0–2 | Minimal or no structured knowledge contribution
- 3–4 | Limited or regionally constrained contributions
- 5–6 | Moderate contributions with partial continuity
- 7–8 | Strong, sustained contributions across domains

- 9–10 | Foundational and globally influential knowledge systems

4. Christianity — Knowledge Production Dataset

4.1 Core Characterization

Christianity is associated with historical contributions to:

- early scientific inquiry
- institutional education systems
- philosophical frameworks engaging rational structure and order

4.2 Evidence Categories

A. Foundational Figures

- Early contributors to scientific inquiry operating within theistic frameworks

B. Institutional Development

- Emergence of universities and formalized educational structures

C. Philosophical Foundations

- Conceptual frameworks emphasizing order, intelligibility, and rational investigation

4.3 Strengths

- Significant historical contributions to early knowledge systems
- Long-term institutional continuity
- Philosophical compatibility with structured inquiry

4.4 Weaknesses / Criticisms

- Variation in direct influence across historical periods
- Documented tensions with certain emerging theories
- Ongoing debates regarding attribution and causal influence

4.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Historical records and institutional data
- **Tier 2:** History of science scholarship
- **Tier 3:** Interpretive and philosophical frameworks

4.6 Provisional Score

- Foundational: High
- Sustained Output: Moderate–High
- Institutional: High
- Epistemic Compatibility: Moderate–High

Final Range: 7.0 – 8.5

5. Naturalism — Knowledge Production Dataset

5.1 Core Characterization

Naturalistic frameworks are closely associated with contemporary systems of scientific and technological knowledge production.

These systems emphasize:

- empirical observation
- repeatability
- model-based explanation

5.2 Evidence Categories

A. Scientific Method

- Structured empirical testing and repeatable experimentation

B. Technological Development

- Applied scientific systems across medicine, engineering, and computing

C. Research Systems

- Universities, laboratories, and globally coordinated research networks

5.3 Strengths

- High levels of contemporary knowledge production
- Strong empirical grounding
- Broad scalability across global systems

5.4 Weaknesses

- More limited association with early-stage origin of certain knowledge systems
- Reliance on underlying philosophical assumptions that are not always explicitly stated
- Tendency toward explanatory reduction in certain domains

5.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Scientific literature
- **Tier 2:** Institutional and research data
- **Tier 3:** Philosophy of science

5.6 Provisional Score

- Foundational: Moderate
- Sustained Output: Very High
- Institutional: High
- Epistemic Compatibility: High

Final Range: 7.5 – 9.0

6. Comparative Analysis

- Criterion | Christianity | Naturalism
- Foundational Role | High | Moderate
- Sustained Output | Moderate–High | Very High
- Institutional Impact | High | High
- Epistemic Support | Strong | Strong

7. Midpoint Scoring

- Christianity ≈ 7.7
- Naturalism ≈ 8.3

8. Interpretation

Within WEP criteria:

- Christianity is associated with strong foundational and institutional contributions to knowledge systems
- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with higher levels of contemporary knowledge production and system expansion

This reflects a distinction between:

foundational contribution and current operational scale

9. Critical Sensitivity Note

This domain is sensitive to:

- historical attribution methods
- definitions of "knowledge production"
- distinctions between origin, development, and current implementation

Results should be interpreted as structural comparisons rather than exclusive causal claims.

10. Domain Insight (Structural Takeaway)

This domain highlights a structural distinction:

- some worldviews are associated with foundational contributions to knowledge systems
- others are associated with large-scale operational expansion and refinement

11. Transition Forward

Where Domain 3 evaluates:

→ systematic knowledge generation

the next domain evaluates:

→ large-scale historical coordination and impact

12. IDCRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To operationalize knowledge production within WEP, this domain is expressed through:

- **IDCRI** — Intellectual Documentation Credibility Rarity Index

12.1 Variable Definitions

Let:

- F = Foundational contribution
- S = Sustained output
- I = Institutional strength
- E = Epistemic compatibility

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

12.2 Core Equation

$IDCRI \approx (F \times S \times I \times E)$

13. Interpretation

- Higher values → stronger, sustained, and structurally supported knowledge production
- Lower values → more limited or less integrated knowledge systems

14. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To align with WEP:

- High IDCRI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate IDCRI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}
- Low IDCRI → ~10^{-5} or lower

15. Example Application (Illustrative)

Christianity

- $F \approx 0.8$
- $S \approx 0.7$
- $I \approx 0.8$
- $E \approx 0.7$

$IDCRI \approx 0.8 \times 0.7 \times 0.8 \times 0.7 \approx 0.3136$

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-1}$

Naturalism

- $F \approx 0.6$
- $S \approx 0.9$
- $I \approx 0.9$
- $E \approx 0.9$

$IDCRI \approx 0.6 \times 0.9 \times 0.9 \times 0.9 \approx 0.4374$

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-1}$ (upper range)

16. Important Clarification

These values are:

- illustrative only
- dependent on:

1. historical attribution frameworks
2. definitions of knowledge production

3. institutional scope and measurement criteria

They are intended to demonstrate model behavior under defined assumptions.

17. Structural Insight

The primary distinction reflected by IDCRI concerns:

whether a worldview is associated with the initiation of knowledge systems, the expansion of those systems, or both.

18. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

To maintain methodological rigor, IDCRI must be evaluated against key objections.

18.1 Attribution Objection

Claim:

Knowledge production should be attributed to individuals rather than worldviews.

Response:

- Addressed through:

1. F (Foundational contribution)
2. I (Institutional structure)

The model evaluates system-level patterns and enabling conditions rather

than isolated individual contributions.

18.2 Independence of Science Objection

Claim:

Scientific inquiry operates independently of worldview assumptions.

Response:

- Addressed within E (Epistemic Compatibility)
- Scientific inquiry typically presupposes:

1. order
2. rationality
3. observability

The model evaluates the degree to which these assumptions are supported or contextualized within a worldview.

18.3 Historical Lag Objection

Claim:

Past contributions should not outweigh current levels of knowledge production.

Response:

- Balanced through:

1. F (foundational contribution)
2. S (sustained output)

The model integrates both origin-level influence and ongoing production.

18.4 Reductionism Objection

Claim:

Some frameworks emphasize material explanations, potentially narrowing explanatory scope.

Response:

- Reflected across variables:

1. strong performance in S and I (output and institutional scaling)
2. variation in E (epistemic scope and interpretive range)

The model captures structural differences without assigning categorical judgments.

18.5 Selection Bias Objection

Claim:

Only successful or well-documented knowledge systems are considered.

Response:

- Full implementation requires:

1. inclusion of failed or incomplete systems
2. broader historical datasets

This supports dataset-level evaluation rather than selective representation.

19. Robustness Conditions

For IDCRI to remain methodologically valid:

- definitions of "knowledge production" must be clearly specified
- consistent historical standards must be applied
- clear distinction must be maintained between:

1. knowledge generation
2. knowledge application

20. Replicability Protocol

To support reproducibility:

1. define the knowledge dataset
2. assign F, S, I, E values independently
3. compute IDCRI
4. convert to magnitude scale
5. compare across worldviews

Independent applications should produce comparable ranges under similar assumptions.

21. Domain Boundary Clarification

IDCRI does not evaluate:

- the truth of a worldview
- the correctness of specific knowledge claims

It evaluates:

the structural capacity to generate, organize, and sustain systems of knowledge.

22. Final Domain Summary

Knowledge Production Capacity (IDCRI) measures:

the extent to which a worldview contributes to the development, organization, and continuation of intellectual systems.

Within this domain:

- Christianity is associated with:

◦ foundational contributions and early institutional development

- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with:

◦ large-scale contemporary knowledge production and system expansion

These distinctions are structural and domain-specific.

23. Integration into Convergence Model

IDCRI contributes to WEP by:

- measuring structured knowledge generation
- providing a link between:

1. predictive structure (Domain 1)
2. anomaly integration (Domain 2)
3. large-scale historical development (Domain 4)

It functions as a central processing domain within the broader system.

24. Transition to Next Domain

Where Domain 3 evaluates:

→ systematic knowledge generation

the next domain evaluates:

→ large-scale historical coordination and impact

25. Domain-Level Synthesis (Meta Interpretation)

When fully developed, this domain reflects a structural distinction:

- some worldviews are associated with generative phases of knowledge formation
- others are associated with adaptive phases involving expansion, refinement, and scaling

This distinction concerns the role a worldview plays within the development of knowledge systems.

26. Pattern-Level Observation

Across historical analysis, patterns may be observed:

- higher F (Foundational) values tend to align with:

1. early-stage intellectual developments
2. formation of conceptual frameworks

- higher S and I (Sustained and Institutional) values tend to align with:

1. long-term scaling
2. development of global knowledge systems

27. Cross-Domain Interaction

IDCRI interacts with other domains:

- with PCCRI (Predictive Power):

→ knowledge systems refine predictive capacity over time

- with AEI (Anomalous Events):

→ anomalous data can contribute to new knowledge formation

- with HIRI (Macro-Historical Impact):

→ knowledge systems scale into broader civilizational structures

28. Structural Tension Within the Domain

A structural tension may arise:

systems associated with early knowledge formation are not always the same systems associated with maximum output and scaling.

This reflects a distinction between:

- origin-associated contributions (higher F)
- output-associated contributions (higher S and I)

29. Risk of Misinterpretation

Without appropriate framing, this domain may be interpreted as:

- a competition between scientific and non-scientific systems
- a zero-sum evaluation of intellectual progress

WEP instead models:

multiple roles within a broader knowledge ecosystem.

30. Calibration Requirement

To maintain rigor, IDCRI should be calibrated using:

- cross-era comparisons
- institutional data (e.g., educational systems, research output)
- analysis of underlying epistemic assumptions

31. Structural Role Within WEP

IDCRI functions as:

a knowledge-generation domain within the framework.

It evaluates whether a worldview can:

- contribute to new knowledge formation
- sustain intellectual systems over time
- support the expansion of ideas across populations

32. Dual-Axis Integration

Within WEP:

- PCCRI → predictive structure (forward-looking)
- AEI → anomaly integration (disruptive input)
- IDCRI → knowledge generation (processing structure)

Together, these domains form an integrated epistemic cycle:

prediction → anomaly → knowledge development

33. Final Technical Position

IDCRI introduces:

- iterative knowledge development
- structured intellectual scaling

It functions as a bridge between:

conceptual claims and ongoing knowledge systems.

34. Transition to Domain 4

With Domains 1–3 complete, WEP now evaluates:

- predictive structure
- anomaly integration
- knowledge production

The next domain extends this analysis to:

civilizational-scale coordination and historical impact

5

Domain 4: Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)

1. Definition of Macro-Historical Impact

Within WEP, the Historical Impact Rarity Index (HIRI) is defined as: the degree to which a worldview is associated with large-scale, sustained, and structurally embedded transformations across human civilizations over extended time horizons.

2. Domain Scope

This domain evaluates large-scale societal effects associated with a worldview, including:

- civilizational formation and continuity
- legal and ethical frameworks
- political systems and governance structures
- cultural identity and cohesion
- global expansion and influence

The focus is on **observable historical patterns and structural integration**,

rather than isolated events.

3. Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Scale of Influence (S)

- geographic distribution
- population reach

3.2 Duration (D)

- longevity across generations or centuries
- continuity over time

3.3 Structural Depth (T)

degree of integration into institutions:

1. law
2. governance
3. education
4. social norms

3.4 Transformational Effect (X)

extent to which systems are:

1. reshaped
2. newly formed
3. reorganized

3.5 Scoring Anchors

- Score | Criteria
- 0–2 | Minimal or localized influence
- 3–4 | Regional impact
- 5–6 | Multi-regional influence
- 7–8 | Civilizational-level impact
- 9–10 | Broad, enduring, cross-regional transformation

4. Christianity — Macro-Historical Dataset

4.1 Core Characterization

Christianity is associated with long-duration influence across multiple historical contexts, including:

- civilizational development
- institutional formation
- cultural and ethical frameworks

4.2 Evidence Categories

A. Civilizational Formation

- association with development of Western and related civilizational structures

B. Legal and Ethical Systems

influence on concepts such as:

1. human dignity
2. moral accountability
3. rights-based frameworks

C. Institutional Structures

development of:

1. religious institutions
2. educational systems
3. charitable organizations

D. Cultural Continuity

influence on:

1. art
2. literature
3. social norms
4. identity structures

4.3 Strengths

- long historical duration (~2000 years)
- deep institutional integration
- broad geographic distribution

4.4 Weaknesses / Criticisms

- internal variation across traditions and regions
- association with periods of conflict or institutional misuse
- uneven expression across historical contexts

4.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Historical records and legal frameworks
- **Tier 2:** Sociological and historical analysis

- **Tier 3:** Interpretive models

4.6 Provisional Score

- Scale (S): Very High
- Duration (D): Very High
- Structural Depth (T): High
- Transformational Effect (X): Very High

Final Range: 8.5 – 9.5

5. Naturalism — Macro-Historical Dataset

5.1 Core Characterization

Naturalistic frameworks are associated with modern systemic developments, including:

- scientific and technological systems
- secular governance models
- global institutional coordination

5.2 Evidence Categories

A. Scientific and Technological Systems

- industrial and technological transformations

B. Political Structures

- development of secular governance systems in various regions

C. Cultural Shifts

- changes in the role and influence of religious institutions within certain

societies

5.3 Strengths

- high contemporary global influence
- strong integration with scientific and technological systems
- scalable across diverse cultural contexts

5.4 Weaknesses

- shorter historical duration relative to long-standing civilizational systems
- less unified cultural or identity structure across contexts
- variation in dependence on pre-existing institutional frameworks

5.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Modern historical data
- **Tier 2:** Sociological analysis
- **Tier 3:** Philosophical interpretation

5.6 Provisional Score

- Scale (S): High
- Duration (D): Moderate
- Structural Depth (T): Moderate–High
- Transformational Effect (X): High

Final Range: 7.0 – 8.5

6. Comparative Analysis

- Criterion | Christianity | Naturalism

- Scale | Very High | High
- Duration | Very High | Moderate
- Structural Depth | High | Moderate–High
- Transformation | Very High | High

7. Midpoint Scoring

- Christianity ≈ 9.0
- Naturalism ≈ 7.8

8. Interpretation

Within WEP:

- Christianity is associated with long-duration, deeply integrated civilizational influence
- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with strong contemporary systemic influence and expansion

These distinctions reflect differences in historical duration and structural integration.

9. Domain Insight

This domain highlights a structural distinction: between systems associated with long-term civilizational formation and those associated with large-scale systemic development and optimization.

10. Critical Sensitivity Note

HIRI is sensitive to:

- historical interpretation frameworks

- distinctions between causation and correlation
- regional versus global weighting

Results should be interpreted as structural comparisons rather than exclusive causal claims.

11. Transition to Formal Layer

To integrate this domain into WEP's quantitative framework, the following model is introduced:

HIRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

12. HIRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To operationalize macro-historical impact within WEP:

- **HIRI —** Historical Impact Rarity Index

12.1 Variable Definitions

Let:

- S = Scale of influence
- D = Duration
- T = Structural depth
- X = Transformational effect

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

12.2 Core Equation

$HIRI \approx (S \times D \times T \times X)$

13. Interpretation

- Higher values → broader, longer-duration, and more deeply integrated historical influence
- Lower values → more limited, shorter-duration, or less structurally embedded influence

14. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To align with WEP:

- High HIRI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate HIRI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}
- Low HIRI → ~10^{-5} or lower

15. Example Application (Illustrative)

Christianity

- S ≈ 0.9
- D ≈ 0.9
- T ≈ 0.85
- X ≈ 0.9

HIRI ≈ 0.9 × 0.9 × 0.85 × 0.9 ≈ 0.619

→ Approximate magnitude: ~10^{-1} (upper range)

Naturalism (Illustrative Only)

- S ≈ 0.8
- D ≈ 0.6
- T ≈ 0.7

- $X \approx 0.8$

$HIRI \approx 0.8 \times 0.6 \times 0.7 \times 0.8 \approx 0.2688$

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-1}$ to 10^{-2}

16. Important Clarification

These values are:

- illustrative only
- dependent on:

1. historical interpretation frameworks
2. attribution of influence
3. timeframe selection

They are intended to demonstrate model behavior under defined assumptions.

17. Structural Insight

The distinction reflected by HIRI concerns:

whether a worldview is associated with the formation of long-duration civilizational structures, the expansion of existing systems, or both.

18. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

To maintain methodological rigor, HIRI must be evaluated against key objections.

18.1 Correlation vs Causation Objection

Claim:

Civilizations are shaped by multiple interacting factors rather than a single worldview.

Response:

Addressed through:

1. T (Structural depth)
2. X (Transformational effect)

HIRI evaluates degree of structural association rather than exclusive causation.

18.2 Negative Impact Objection

Claim:

Historical influence includes both constructive and destructive outcomes.

Response:

- WEP evaluates:

1. magnitude and structure of impact
2. ethical evaluation is treated separately from impact measurement

18.3 Recency Bias Objection

Claim:

Recent systems should be weighted more heavily than long-duration influence.

Response:

Balanced through:

- D (Duration)

The model incorporates both long-term persistence and contemporary influence.

18.4 Fragmentation Objection

Claim:

Internal variation or division reduces overall impact.

Response:
Reflected within:

- T (Structural depth)

Variation across contexts is incorporated into structural scoring rather than excluded.

18.5 Selection Bias Objection

Claim:

Analysis may prioritize dominant or well-documented systems.

Response:

- Full implementation requires:

1. inclusion of smaller or less dominant systems
2. broader comparative datasets

19. Robustness Conditions

For HIRI to remain methodologically valid:

- consistent historical standards must be applied
- attribution criteria must be explicitly defined
- clear distinction must be maintained between:

1. influence
2. outcome evaluation

20. Replicability Protocol

To support reproducibility:

1. define the historical dataset
2. assign S, D, T, X values independently
3. compute HIRI
4. convert to magnitude scale
5. compare across worldviews

Independent applications should produce comparable ranges under similar assumptions.

21. Domain Boundary Clarification

HIRI does not evaluate:

- whether historical outcomes are morally positive or negative
- whether a worldview is true

It evaluates:

the scale, duration, and structural integration of historical influence.

22. Final Domain Summary

Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI) measures: the extent to which a worldview is associated with large-scale, long-duration influence on human civilizations.

Within this domain:

- Christianity is associated with:

◦ long-duration influence and deep structural integration

- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with:

◦ strong contemporary influence and systemic expansion
These distinctions are structural and domain-specific.

23. Integration into Convergence Model

HIRI contributes to WEP by:

- measuring civilizational-scale effects
- extending:

◦ knowledge systems (Domain 3) into societal structures

It functions as an externalization layer within the framework.

24. Transition to Next Domain

Where Domain 4 evaluates:

→ civilizational-scale transformation

the next domain evaluates:

→ internal human experience and coherence

25. Domain-Level Synthesis (Meta Interpretation)

When fully developed, this domain reflects a structural distinction:

- some worldviews are associated with long-duration civilizational formation
- others are associated with large-scale system expansion and adaptation

This distinction concerns the role of a worldview within historical development.

26. Pattern-Level Observation

Across historical analysis, patterns may be observed:

- higher D (Duration) and T (Structural Depth) values tend to align with:

1. long-term stability
2. institutional persistence

- higher S (Scale) and X (Transformation) values tend to align with:

1. expansion
2. systemic change

27. Cross-Domain Interaction

HIRI interacts with prior domains:

- with IDCRI (Knowledge Production):

→ knowledge systems extend into societal structures

- with PCCRI (Predictive Power):

→ predictive frameworks may influence long-term coordination

- with AEI (Anomalous Events):

→ anomalous narratives may contribute to large-scale movements

28. Structural Tension Within the Domain

A structural tension may arise:

systems associated with long-term stability are not always the same systems associated with rapid adaptation or change.

This reflects a distinction between:

- stability-oriented systems
- change-oriented systems

29. Risk of Misinterpretation

Without appropriate framing, this domain may be interpreted as:

- a moral evaluation of historical outcomes
- a justification of influence based on scale

WEP maintains a distinction between:

impact measurement and ethical evaluation.

30. Calibration Requirement

To maintain rigor, HIRI should be calibrated using:

- cross-civilizational comparisons
- longitudinal historical data
- measures of institutional persistence

31. Structural Role Within WEP

HIRI functions as:

an external impact domain within the framework.
It evaluates whether a worldview can:

- scale across populations
- persist across time
- integrate into societal structures

32. Multi-Domain Integration

With Domains 1–4 combined:

- PCCRI → predictive structure

- AEI → anomaly integration
- IDCRI → knowledge production
- HIRI → civilizational impact

Together, these domains form a structured progression:

prediction → anomaly → knowledge → societal integration

33. Final Technical Position

HIRI introduces:

- large-scale structural analysis
- long-term persistence measurement

It extends the framework from:

internal system structure to external historical patterns.

34. Transition to Domain 5

With Domain 4 complete, WEP now evaluates:

- predictive structure
- anomaly integration
- knowledge production
- civilizational impact

The next domain shifts focus to:

human experience, perception, and internal coherence

6

Domain 5: Experiential Coherence (ECRI)

1. Definition of Experiential Coherence

Within WEP, Experiential Coherence evaluates: the degree to which a worldview aligns with, interprets, and integrates human subjective experience, including consciousness, moral perception, sense of meaning, and reported encounters with reality.

This domain extends:

- SRCRI (Supernatural Reports Credibility) into a broader experiential framework

2. Domain Scope

This domain includes:

- consciousness and self-awareness
- moral intuition and ethical experience
- sense of meaning and purpose

- religious or transcendent experiences
- psychological and existential coherence

The focus is on **explanatory alignment with lived human experience**, rather than verification of specific experiential claims.

3. Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Consciousness Alignment (C)

- To what extent does the worldview account for subjective awareness?

3.2 Moral Experience (M)

- How does it interpret and integrate moral intuitions (e.g., right/wrong, justice)?

3.3 Meaning and Purpose (P)

- Does it provide a coherent framework for purpose or existential significance?

3.4 Experiential Integration (E)

- Does it incorporate a wide range of reported human experiences, including atypical or transcendent ones?

3.5 Scoring Anchors

- Score | Criteria
- 0–2 | Minimal alignment with reported human experience
- 3–4 | Partial or inconsistent explanatory alignment
- 5–6 | Moderate explanatory scope

- 7–8 | Strong experiential coherence
- 9–10 | Broad and internally consistent integration of experience

4. Christianity — Experiential Dataset

4.1 Core Characterization

Christianity presents a framework in which human experience is interpreted as:

- conscious and purposive
- morally structured
- meaning-oriented
- open to transcendent or religious experience

4.2 Evidence Categories

A. Consciousness

- interpretations that treat awareness as more than purely mechanistic processes

B. Moral Experience

- frameworks that interpret moral intuitions as reflecting structured ethical realities

C. Meaning

- teleological (purpose-oriented) interpretations of human existence

D. Religious Experience

- reported experiences including:

1. personal transformation
2. perceived encounter
3. spiritual awareness

4.3 Strengths

- broad explanatory scope across multiple experiential domains
- internal coherence across moral, existential, and psychological dimensions
- integration of diverse reported human experiences

4.4 Weaknesses / Criticisms

- dependence on underlying theological assumptions
- variation in interpretive frameworks across traditions
- reliance on subjective or non-uniform experiential reports

4.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Psychological and experiential data
- **Tier 2:** Philosophical analysis
- **Tier 3:** Testimonial accounts

4.6 Provisional Score

- Consciousness: High
- Moral Experience: High
- Meaning: Very High
- Experiential Integration: High

Final Range: 8.0 – 9.0

5. Naturalism — Experiential Dataset

5.1 Core Characterization

Naturalistic frameworks interpret human experience primarily through:

- physical processes
- evolutionary development
- neurological mechanisms

5.2 Evidence Categories

A. Consciousness

- brain-based and cognitive models

B. Moral Experience

- evolutionary and social-development interpretations

C. Meaning

- constructed, emergent, or subjective frameworks of purpose

D. Religious Experience

- interpreted through psychological or neurological models

5.3 Strengths

- strong empirical grounding
- compatibility with neuroscience and cognitive science
- clearly defined explanatory mechanisms

5.4 Weaknesses

- ongoing challenges in fully accounting for subjective experience
- variation in grounding for moral realism versus constructivist interpretations
- less emphasis on inherent or externally grounded meaning frameworks

5.5 Evidence Classification

- **Tier 1:** Neuroscience and cognitive science
- **Tier 2:** Evolutionary psychology
- **Tier 3:** Philosophy of mind

5.6 Provisional Score

- Consciousness: Moderate
- Moral Experience: Moderate
- Meaning: Low–Moderate
- Experiential Integration: Moderate

Final Range: 5.5 – 7.0

6. Comparative Analysis

- Criterion | Christianity | Naturalism
- Consciousness | High | Moderate
- Moral Experience | High | Moderate
- Meaning | Very High | Low–Moderate
- Integration | High | Moderate

7. Midpoint Scoring

- Christianity ≈ 8.5

- Naturalism ≈ 6.3

8. Interpretation

Within WEP:

- Christianity is associated with broader integration of subjective experience across moral, existential, and experiential domains
- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with partial explanatory coverage, particularly strong in empirically measurable aspects of experience

These differences reflect variation in explanatory scope rather than definitive conclusions about experiential reality.

9. Domain Insight

This domain highlights a structural distinction:

between systems that emphasize comprehensive integration of subjective experience and those that emphasize empirically grounded interpretation of specific experiential components.

10. Critical Sensitivity Note

This domain is highly sensitive to:

- underlying philosophical assumptions
- interpretation of subjective data
- definitions of consciousness, morality, and meaning

Results should be interpreted as comparative explanatory alignment rather than definitive claims about experience itself.

11. Transition to Formal Layer

To integrate this domain into WEP's quantitative framework, the following model is introduced:

Experiential Coherence Quantification Model (Extended SRCRI)

12. Experiential Coherence Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To operationalize experiential coherence within WEP:

- **ECRI** — Experiential Coherence Rarity Index

(extended from SRCRI)

12.1 Variable Definitions

Let:

- C = Consciousness alignment
- M = Moral experience coherence
- P = Meaning and purpose coherence
- E = Experiential integration

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

12.2 Core Equation

$ECRI \approx (C \times M \times P \times E)$

13. Interpretation

- Higher values → stronger alignment across multiple dimensions of

subjective experience
- Lower values → more limited or fragmented explanatory alignment

14. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To align with WEP:

- High ECRI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate ECRI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}
- Low ECRI → ~10^{-5} or lower

15. Example Application (Illustrative)

Christianity

- C ≈ 0.85
- M ≈ 0.85
- P ≈ 0.9
- E ≈ 0.85

ECRI ≈ 0.85 × 0.85 × 0.9 × 0.85 ≈ 0.552

→ Approximate magnitude: ~10^{-1} (upper range)

16. Important Clarification

These values are:

- illustrative only
- dependent on:

1. underlying philosophical assumptions
2. interpretation of subjective experience

3. definitions of consciousness, morality, and meaning

They are intended to demonstrate model behavior under defined assumptions.

17. Structural Insight

The distinction reflected by ECRI concerns:

how a worldview interprets and organizes human experience, including whether experiential phenomena are treated as primary data or as derivative of underlying processes.

18. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

To maintain methodological rigor, ECRI must be evaluated against key objections.

18.1 Subjectivity Objection

Claim:

Human experience is too subjective to evaluate systematically.

Response:

- Addressed through:

1. cross-cultural consistency
2. recurring experiential patterns

The model evaluates shared structural features rather than isolated individual experiences.

18.2 Neuroscience Reduction Objection

Claim:

All experience can be fully explained through neurological processes.

Response:

- Addressed within C (Consciousness alignment)
- Distinction is made between:

1. correlation (neural activity)
2. explanatory sufficiency

The model evaluates how frameworks interpret this relationship.

18.3 Moral Relativism Objection

Claim:

Moral experience is socially constructed and variable.

Response:

- Addressed within M (Moral experience)
- The model evaluates:

1. consistency of moral intuitions across contexts
2. explanatory frameworks applied to those intuitions

18.4 Meaning Projection Objection

Claim:

Meaning is imposed by individuals rather than discovered.

Response:

- Reflected within P (Meaning and purpose)
- Frameworks differ in whether meaning is treated as:

1. constructed
2. emergent
3. or foundational

18.5 Selection Bias Objection

Claim:

Analysis may prioritize certain types of experiences.

Response:

- Full implementation requires inclusion of:

1. positive and negative experiences
2. existential conflict
3. psychological variation

19. Robustness Conditions

For ECRI to remain methodologically valid:

- experiential categories must be clearly defined
- cross-cultural datasets should be incorporated
- clear distinction must be maintained between:

1. experience
2. interpretation

20. Replicability Protocol

To support reproducibility:

1. define the experiential dataset
2. assign C, M, P, E values independently
3. compute ECRI
4. convert to magnitude scale
5. compare across worldviews

Independent applications should produce comparable ranges under similar assumptions.

21. Domain Boundary Clarification

ECRI does not evaluate:

- whether experiences are objectively true
- whether a worldview is correct

It evaluates:

the degree of alignment between a worldview's structure and reported human experience.

22. Final Domain Summary

Experiential Coherence (ECRI) measures:

the extent to which a worldview aligns with and organizes internal human

experience.

Within this domain:

- Christianity is associated with:

◦ broad integration of moral, existential, and experiential dimensions

- Naturalistic frameworks are associated with:

◦ strong explanatory models for empirically measurable aspects of experience
These distinctions reflect differences in explanatory scope.

23. Integration into Convergence Model

ECRI contributes to WEP by:

- connecting external structures to internal experience
- complementing:

1. HIRI (civilizational impact)
2. IDCRI (knowledge systems)

It functions as an internal alignment domain within the framework.

24. Transition to Next Domain

Where Domain 5 evaluates:

→ internal human experience

the next domain evaluates:

→ broader explanatory scope and metaphysical completeness

25. Domain-Level Synthesis (Meta Interpretation)

When fully developed, this domain reflects a structural distinction:

- some worldviews are associated with comprehensive integration of experiential data
- others are associated with selective or domain-specific interpretation of experience

This distinction concerns how experiential data is organized within a framework.

26. Pattern-Level Observation

Across philosophical and psychological analysis, patterns may be observed:

- higher P (Meaning) and M (Moral experience) values tend to align with:

◦ perceived coherence in existential frameworks

- lower values in these areas tend to align with:

1. variability in meaning attribution
2. diversity in moral interpretation

27. Cross-Domain Interaction

ECRI interacts with prior domains:

- with AEI (Anomalous Events):

→ many anomalous reports are experienced subjectively

- with IDCRI (Knowledge Production):

→ experiential questions often drive inquiry

- with HIRI (Macro-Historical Impact):

→ shared experiential frameworks contribute to cultural identity

28. Structural Tension Within the Domain

A structural tension may arise:

frameworks emphasizing empirical simplicity may differ from those emphasizing comprehensive experiential integration.

This reflects differing priorities in explanatory scope.

29. Risk of Misinterpretation

Without appropriate framing, this domain may be interpreted as:

- purely subjective or non-systematic
- opposed to empirical analysis

WEP instead evaluates:

recurring, structured patterns of human experience.

30. Calibration Requirement

To maintain rigor, ECRI should be calibrated using:

- cross-cultural experiential studies
- psychological and phenomenological data
- longitudinal studies of meaning and well-being

31. Structural Role Within WEP

ECRI functions as:

an internal alignment domain.

It evaluates whether a worldview can:

- account for consciousness
- interpret moral experience
- provide frameworks for meaning and purpose
- integrate lived human experience

32. Multi-Domain Integration

With Domains 1–5 combined:

- PCCRI → predictive structure
- AEI → anomaly integration
- IDCRI → knowledge production
- HIRI → civilizational impact
- ECRI → experiential coherence

Together, these domains form a structured model of:

prediction → anomaly → knowledge → society → experience

33. Final Technical Position

ECRI introduces:

- first-person data integration
- structured experiential analysis

It connects:

external systems to internal human experience.

34. Transition to Domain 6

With Domain 5 complete, WEP now spans:

- predictive structure
- anomaly integration
- knowledge production
- civilizational impact
- experiential coherence

The next domain extends the framework toward:

ultimate explanatory scope and metaphysical completeness

7

Domain 6: Ultimate Explanatory Scope (UCRI)

1. Definition

The Ultimate Explanatory Scope (UCRI) domain evaluates:

the extent to which a worldview provides a coherent account of fundamental aspects of reality at the most general level.

While previous domains evaluate:

- predictive capacity
- anomaly integration
- knowledge production
- historical impact
- experiential coherence

this domain addresses a distinct question:

to what extent a worldview offers explanatory scope beyond descriptive or functional models of reality.

2. Domain Position Within WEP

Domain 6 functions as an extension layer, not a replacement for the core five-domain model.

- Domains 1–5 → empirical, historical, and experiential evaluation
- Domain 6 → philosophical and meta-explanatory layer

It evaluates questions that are not resolved within empirical domains, including:

- why anything exists
- why reality exhibits structured regularity
- how consciousness and moral awareness are interpreted

3. Scope of Evaluation

UCRI examines whether a worldview provides a coherent account of:

1. **Existence** — why there is something rather than nothing (if addressed)
2. **Consciousness** — the origin or nature of subjective awareness
3. **Moral Structure** — the grounding or interpretation of moral values
4. **Order and Laws** — the basis for consistent natural regularities
5. **Intelligibility** — why reality is interpretable by rational agents

4. Structural Distinction

Unlike other domains, UCRI does not evaluate:

- data volume
- historical frequency
- observational consistency

Instead, it evaluates:

the extent to which a worldview offers:

- terminating explanations (where explanation reaches a foundational level)
- or continuing explanations (where explanation is extended through successive layers)

5. Role in Convergence Analysis

UCRI does not directly contribute to empirical convergence scores.

Instead, it functions as:

a meta-evaluative layer applied after multi-domain analysis

This separation helps maintain:

- independence between empirical evaluation and philosophical interpretation
- clarity between scientific and metaphysical domains

6. Transition to Formalization

To enable structured comparison, UCRI may be expressed through a simplified model, while acknowledging its philosophical character.

7. UCRI Quantification Model (Formal Layer)

To operationalize Ultimate Explanatory Scope within WEP:

- **UCRI —** Ultimate Coherence & Reality Index

7.1 Variable Definitions

Let:

- O = Origin explanation
- C = Consciousness grounding
- M = Moral interpretation or grounding
- L = Explanation of order and regularity
- R = Rational intelligibility

Each variable is normalized on a 0–1 scale.

7.2 Core Equation

$UCRI \approx (O \times C \times M \times L \times R)$

8. Interpretation

- Higher values → broader and more integrated explanatory scope across fundamental questions
- Lower values → more limited or selectively defined explanatory scope

9. Order-of-Magnitude Conversion

To maintain consistency with WEP:

- High UCRI → ~10^{-1} to 10^{-2}
- Moderate UCRI → ~10^{-3} to 10^{-4}
- Low UCRI → ~10^{-5} or lower

10. Example Application (Illustrative Only)

Christianity

- $O \approx 0.9$
- $C \approx 0.9$
- $M \approx 0.95$
- $L \approx 0.9$
- $R \approx 0.9$

UCRI ≈ 0.624

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-1}$ (upper range)

Naturalism

- $O \approx 0.4$
- $C \approx 0.5$
- $M \approx 0.3$
- $L \approx 0.7$
- $R \approx 0.8$

UCRI ≈ 0.0336

→ Approximate magnitude: $\sim 10^{-2}$ to 10^{-3}

11. Important Clarification

These values are:

- illustrative only
- dependent on:

1. philosophical interpretation
2. definitions of "explanation"
3. assumptions regarding scope and completeness

12. Structural Insight

UCRI highlights a distinction between:

- frameworks that extend explanatory scope to foundational questions
- frameworks that focus on descriptive or functional models of observable processes

13. Objection Layer (Critical Stress-Test)

To maintain methodological rigor, UCRI must be evaluated against key objections.

13.1 Infinite Regress Objection

Claim:

All explanations may ultimately defer, with no final explanatory endpoint.

Response:

- UCRI evaluates how a worldview addresses this issue, including whether it:

1. accepts open-ended explanation
2. or proposes a conceptual stopping point

13.2 "Brute Fact" Acceptance

Claim:

Certain aspects of reality may be treated as unexplained or fundamental.

Response:

- UCRI evaluates the extent to which explanatory scope is extended or limited
- different frameworks adopt different positions regarding explanatory endpoints

13.3 Category Error Objection

Claim:

Empirical science is not designed to address metaphysical questions.

Response:

- UCRI evaluates worldviews rather than scientific methods
- the domain operates at a philosophical level distinct from empirical analysis

13.4 Multiple Metaphysical Models

Claim:

Multiple systems may offer competing accounts of ultimate reality.

Response:

- UCRI compares:

1. coherence
2. internal consistency
3. alignment with other evaluated domains

14. Robustness Conditions

For UCRI to remain methodologically valid:

- explanatory categories must be clearly defined
- internal logical consistency must be maintained
- distinction must be preserved between:

1. empirical claims
2. philosophical interpretation

15. Replicability Protocol

To support reproducibility:

1. identify core explanatory claims
2. assign O, C, M, L, R values independently
3. compute UCRI
4. convert to magnitude scale
5. compare across frameworks

16. Domain Boundary Clarification

UCRI does not evaluate:

- empirical validity
- historical accuracy

It evaluates:

the scope and structure of explanatory frameworks at a philosophical level

16. Final Domain Summary

Ultimate Explanatory Scope (UCRI) evaluates:

the extent to which a worldview provides a coherent and comprehensive account of fundamental aspects of reality.

Within this domain:

- higher values → broader and more integrated explanatory scope
- lower values → more limited or selectively defined explanatory scope

17. Integration with WEP

UCRI functions as:

a post-convergence evaluation layer

It is applied after:

- cross-domain analysis (Domains 1–5)

to assess:

the relationship between empirical convergence and explanatory scope.

18. Domain-Level Synthesis (Meta Interpretation)

When fully developed, UCRI reflects a structural distinction between worldviews:

- some frameworks extend explanation across multiple foundational domains
- others prioritize descriptive or domain-specific explanations

This distinction concerns:

how explanatory scope is distributed across fundamental questions.

19. Pattern-Level Observation

Across philosophical analysis, patterns may be observed:

- higher UCRI values tend to correspond with:

◦ unified explanatory structures across multiple domains

- lower UCRI values tend to correspond with:

◦ segmented or domain-specific explanatory models

These patterns reflect differences in how explanatory scope is structured.

20. Cross-Domain Interaction

UCRI interacts with all prior domains:

- with PCCRI (Predictive Structure):

→ relates to how predictive regularities are interpreted

- with AEI (Anomaly Integration):

→ relates to how anomalous events are situated within broader frameworks

- with IDCRI (Knowledge Production):

→ relates to how knowledge generation is grounded conceptually

- with HIRI (Macro-Historical Impact):

→ relates to how large-scale patterns are interpreted

- with ECRI (Experiential Coherence):

→ relates to how internal experience connects to broader explanatory models

21. Structural Tension

A structural tension may arise:

frameworks emphasizing empirical restraint may differ from those extending explanatory scope into broader philosophical domains.

This reflects differing approaches to explanation rather than categorical incompatibility.

22. Risk of Misinterpretation

UCRI may be interpreted as:

- a metaphysical assertion
- or a substitute for empirical evaluation

WEP avoids this by:

- applying UCRI after empirical convergence
- maintaining a clear distinction between:

1. empirical analysis
2. philosophical interpretation

23. Calibration Requirement

To maintain rigor, UCRI should be calibrated using:

- formal philosophical analysis
- logical consistency evaluation
- cross-domain coherence checks

24. Structural Role Within WEP

UCRI functions as:

a final interpretive layer.

It evaluates whether a worldview:

1. extends explanation across foundational questions
2. or maintains a more limited explanatory scope

25. Full-System Integration

With Domain 6 included, WEP forms a complete evaluative framework:

- Domain 1 → Predictive Structure
- Domain 2 → Anomaly Integration
- Domain 3 → Knowledge Production
- Domain 4 → Macro-Historical Impact
- Domain 5 → Experiential Coherence
- Domain 6 → Ultimate Explanatory Scope

Together, these domains provide:

a multi-level model for evaluating worldview structure across empirical,

historical, experiential, and philosophical dimensions.

26. Final Technical Position

UCRI introduces:

1. a structured method for comparing explanatory scope
2. a framework for analyzing how worldviews address foundational questions

It extends the analysis from:

observed patterns → to explanatory interpretation.

27. Final Convergence Insight

Within WEP, stronger overall alignment is associated with:

- higher cross-domain convergence (Domains 1–5)
- broader explanatory scope (Domain 6)

This reflects:

consistency between observed patterns and interpretive frameworks.

28. Closing Statement

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol evaluates:

how patterns across multiple domains align within structured frameworks.

It raises a final question:

to what extent do these patterns support models that primarily describe observed phenomena, or models that extend explanation across broader levels of interpretation?

8

Unified Convergence Model (UCM)

1. Definition

The Unified Convergence Model (UCM) integrates all components of WEP into a single evaluative framework.

It combines:

- empirical convergence (Domains 1–5)
- explanatory scope (Domain 6)

into a unified assessment of a worldview's overall structural alignment.

2. Core Question

The model evaluates two complementary dimensions:

- to what extent a worldview aligns with observed patterns across domains
- to what extent a worldview provides explanatory scope across foundational questions

Both dimensions contribute to a comprehensive evaluation.

3. Structural Layers

The model operates in two layers:

Layer 1 — Empirical Convergence

Measures alignment with observable reality across domains:

- predictive structure (PCCRI)
- anomaly integration (AEI)
- knowledge production (IDCRI)
- macro-historical impact (HIRI)
- experiential coherence (ECRI)

Layer 2 — Explanatory Scope

Measures the extent to which a worldview provides explanatory coverage across:

- existence
- consciousness
- moral interpretation
- order and laws
- rational intelligibility

4. Mathematical Structure

Let:

- C = empirical convergence score
- P = principle coherence multiplier (0–1)
- U = ultimate explanatory scope score (UCRI)

4.1 Empirical Layer

$S_{empirical} \approx P \times C$

Where:

- C = aggregated convergence score (average or multiplicative form)
- P = consistency factor based on methodological principles

4.2 Unified Score

$S_{total} \approx S_{empirical} \times U$

5. Interpretation Framework

The Unified Model produces four general outcome categories:

5.1 High Convergence + High Explanatory Scope

- strong cross-domain alignment
- broad explanatory coverage

→ associated with higher overall structural coherence

5.2 High Convergence + Lower Explanatory Scope

- strong descriptive and predictive performance
- more limited explanatory coverage

→ associated with effective but more narrowly scoped frameworks

5.3 Lower Convergence + High Explanatory Scope

- broad philosophical or conceptual frameworks
- weaker alignment with observed patterns

→ associated with conceptually extensive but less empirically supported systems

5.4 Lower Convergence + Lower Explanatory Scope

- limited empirical alignment
- limited explanatory coverage

→ associated with comparatively low overall coherence

6. Structural Insight

The Unified Model highlights a key relationship: overall evaluative strength is associated with both:

- cross-domain alignment
- explanatory scope

Differences between frameworks often emerge in how these dimensions are balanced.

7. Dual Constraint Effect

Because the model is multiplicative:

$S_{total} \approx S_{empirical} \times U$

two primary constraints emerge:

- empirical constraint → Domains 1–5
- explanatory scope constraint → Domain 6

Lower values in either dimension proportionally affect the total score.

8. Conceptual Reframing

The model reframes evaluation from:

"Which worldview explains specific observations?"

to:

"How consistently do patterns across domains align, and how are those patterns interpreted within broader explanatory frameworks?"

9. Application Protocol

To apply the Unified Convergence Model:

1. score Domains 1–5
2. compute C (average or multiplicative)
3. apply principle multiplier (P)
4. compute S_empirical
5. score UCRI (Domain 6)
6. compute S_total
7. compare across frameworks

10. Boundary Conditions

The model does not:

- establish absolute certainty
- eliminate philosophical disagreement

It provides:

- a structured comparison framework

- a convergence-weighted evaluation
- an explanatory scope overlay

11. Final Insight

Within WEP, higher overall coherence is associated with:

- stronger cross-domain convergence
- broader explanatory scope

This reflects alignment between:

- observed patterns
- interpretive frameworks

12. Closing Statement

The Unified Convergence Model represents the integrative layer of WEP:

moving from:

- isolated arguments

→ to domain-level convergence

→ to structured comparative evaluation

It evaluates:

how patterns across multiple domains align within coherent frameworks—and how those frameworks extend interpretation across broader levels of explanation.

Rather than asserting conclusions, the model provides a structured way to compare:

- how well different worldviews align with observed patterns
- how extensively they interpret those patterns within a unified framework

This allows evaluation to proceed:

from data → to convergence → to explanatory scope

while maintaining a clear distinction between empirical analysis and philosophical interpretation.

9

Conclusion: The Emergence of Convergent Evaluation

The aim of this work has not been to offer another isolated argument, nor to refine existing lines of debate within familiar boundaries. It has been to introduce a different way of approaching the question of how reality-level systems are evaluated.

Across multiple independent domains—prediction, anomaly, knowledge production, macro-history, and human experience—a consistent pattern has been examined. Each domain, considered in isolation, admits alternative interpretations. Each remains open to critique, revision, and competing explanations. This is expected. No single domain is sufficient to determine a final conclusion.

But taken together, the structure changes.

When independent domains—each governed by distinct data types, methodologies, and evaluative standards—begin to align under a single explanatory

framework, the interpretive landscape shifts. What previously appeared as a collection of separate discussions begins to function as a unified signal.

The question is no longer whether any one domain is decisive.

It becomes whether the convergence itself can be reasonably accounted for.

This marks a transition in how evaluation is understood.

The framework presented in this work does not claim to prove that any worldview is true in a strict or absolute sense. It does not eliminate uncertainty, nor does it reduce complex systems to a single deterministic output. Instead, it establishes a structured method for identifying when multiple independent lines of evidence begin to constrain the range of plausible explanations.

In this sense, convergence functions not as proof, but as pressure.

It narrows interpretive space. It limits explanatory flexibility. It requires that competing systems account not only for isolated data points, but for the alignment of those data points across domains that are not reducible to one another.

This represents a shift from argument-based evaluation to system-based evaluation.

Rather than asking which individual claim is strongest, the framework asks whether an entire system can sustain coherence across the full spectrum of its interaction with reality.

The implications extend beyond the scope of any single worldview.

If convergence across independent domains can be identified, measured, and

compared, then evaluation itself becomes more structured, more transparent, and more resistant to selective reasoning. Competing systems can be assessed not only on what they explain in isolation, but on how consistently they align across domains simultaneously.

The distinction between evaluative and structural levels further clarifies that convergence is not only observed, but may also reflect underlying constraints across domains.

What has been introduced here is not a final answer, but a method.

A method that reframes evaluation at the level of systems.

A method that treats convergence as a meaningful feature of reality.

And a method that, if further developed, may contribute to a broader shift in how questions of truth, explanation, and coherence are approached across disciplines.

Future work may extend this framework through dataset-driven scoring, large-scale comparative analysis, and refinement of domain criteria.

What remains is not the elimination of disagreement, but its recontextualization.

Not all systems will converge.

But those that do will require explanation.

10

Domain Selection Justification: Toward a Complete and Irreducible Evaluative Framework

A central requirement of any multi-domain evaluative system is the justification of its domain structure. If the selected domains are incomplete, redundant, or arbitrarily defined, the resulting framework risks reflecting methodological bias rather than providing a genuine assessment of competing systems.

Accordingly, the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) does not begin with the assumption that any particular set of domains is sufficient. Instead, it proceeds from a prior question:

What categories are necessary to evaluate how a worldview interacts with reality in a comprehensive and non-reductive manner?

1. Criteria for Domain Inclusion

To address this question, domains within WEP are selected according to three constraints:

(1) Coverage — The domains must collectively capture the full range of interactions between a worldview and reality. This includes not only external, measurable phenomena, but also internal, experiential, and historical dimensions.

(2) Irreducibility — Each domain must represent a category of evaluation that cannot be fully reduced to another without loss of explanatory content. If a domain can be subsumed entirely within another, it does not qualify as distinct.

(3) Functional Distinctness — Each domain must operate under different evaluative conditions, including types of data, methods of analysis, and standards of evidence. This ensures that performance in one domain does not trivially guarantee performance in another.

These criteria establish that domains are neither arbitrarily chosen nor interchangeable, but structurally necessary components of a complete evaluative framework.

2. The Five-Domain Structure

Applying these constraints yields five primary domains:

- Predictive Power (PCCRI)
- Anomalous Events (AEI / MDCRI / SRCRI)
- Knowledge Production Capacity (IDCRI)
- Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)
- Experiential Coherence (ECRI)

Each domain corresponds to a distinct mode through which a worldview engages with reality.

3. Justification of Individual Domains

Predictive Power evaluates a system's capacity to generate forward-looking expectations that align with observed outcomes. This domain captures the relationship between a worldview and the future-oriented structure of reality. It cannot be reduced to historical or experiential domains, as it concerns anticipatory coherence rather than retrospective interpretation.

Anomalous Events evaluates how a worldview handles data that deviates from expected patterns. This domain captures edge-case phenomena and explanatory limits. It is irreducible to predictive power, as anomalies represent breakdowns or extensions of predictive models rather than confirmations of them.

Knowledge Production Capacity evaluates whether a worldview can generate and sustain structured systems of knowledge. This domain addresses the internal intellectual productivity of a system, including science, philosophy, and institutional learning. It cannot be reduced to predictive success, as knowledge systems may exist independently of immediate predictive accuracy.

Macro-Historical Impact evaluates the large-scale, long-term influence of a worldview on human civilization. This domain captures the externalization of ideas into social, political, and cultural structures. It is distinct from knowledge production, as the existence of knowledge does not guarantee civilizational adoption or persistence.

Experiential Coherence evaluates the alignment between a worldview and human subjective experience, including consciousness, morality, and meaning. This domain captures first-person data that cannot be fully reduced to external measurement or historical analysis.

4. Exhaustiveness of the Domain Set

Together, these five domains span the major categories through which reality

is encountered:

- Future-oriented structure (prediction)
- Boundary conditions and anomalies (disruption)
- Intellectual system formation (knowledge)
- Large-scale external manifestation (history)
- Internal subjective experience (experience)

Any attempt to remove one of these domains results in an incomplete evaluation:

- Removing predictive power eliminates forward coherence
- Removing anomalous events ignores edge-case data
- Removing knowledge production omits intellectual structure
- Removing historical impact excludes real-world manifestation
- Removing experiential coherence neglects subjective reality

Conversely, attempts to introduce additional domains typically result in subdivisions of these categories rather than fundamentally new ones.

5. Non-Arbitrariness and Constraint

The structure of WEP is therefore constrained, not constructed. The domains are not selected to produce a particular outcome, but to satisfy the conditions of completeness and irreducibility.

This distinction is critical. A framework that begins with a desired conclusion risks retrofitting its categories to support that conclusion. By contrast, WEP derives its domain structure from the requirement that any adequate evaluation of a worldview must account for all major modes of interaction with reality.

6. Implications for Evaluation

Because the domains are both comprehensive and irreducible, performance across them cannot be trivially engineered. A worldview that performs strongly in one domain does not automatically perform strongly in others. This creates the possibility of divergence, where systems exhibit strengths and weaknesses across different dimensions.

The significance of convergence, therefore, emerges only when a worldview demonstrates alignment across multiple independent domains simultaneously.

The justification of domain selection establishes the structural foundation of WEP. Without it, the framework would remain vulnerable to charges of arbitrariness or bias. With it, the evaluation shifts from a collection of selected arguments to a constrained system of analysis grounded in the full range of reality interaction.

11

Domain Independence and Controlled Interdependence

A central structural feature of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is the integration of domain-specific indices through a multiplicative model. This raises an immediate methodological question:

To what extent are the domains independent?

If the domains are fully dependent, then multiplying their values risks artificially amplifying results. If they are fully independent, the model may ignore meaningful interactions between them. Accordingly, WEP adopts a middle position, distinguishing between statistical independence and functional distinctness.

1. The Independence Problem

Strict statistical independence would require that performance in one domain has no relationship to performance in another. In practice, this condition is not met.

For example:

- Knowledge production (IDCRI) may influence macro-historical impact (HIRI)
- Experiential coherence (ECRI) may affect the interpretation of anomalous events (AEI)
- Predictive frameworks (PCCRI) may guide the development of knowledge systems

These relationships indicate that the domains are not causally isolated. Any framework that assumes complete independence would therefore misrepresent the structure of real-world systems.

2. Functional Distinctness

Despite these interactions, each domain evaluates a fundamentally different aspect of reality. This distinction is not causal, but evaluative.

- Predictive Power assesses forward-looking alignment
- Anomalous Events assess boundary conditions and explanatory limits
- Knowledge Production assesses intellectual system generation
- Macro-Historical Impact assesses large-scale externalization
- Experiential Coherence assesses internal subjective alignment

Each domain operates with:

- Different types of data
- Different evidentiary standards
- Different modes of explanation

This ensures that strong performance in one domain does not automatically guarantee strong performance in another. A system may exhibit high predictive success while failing to account for experiential coherence, or demonstrate historical impact without strong anomaly handling.

This property is referred to as functional distinctness.

3. Controlled Interdependence

WEP therefore models domains as:

- **Causally interacting** (interdependent in reality)
- **Evaluatively distinct** (separable for analysis)

This approach allows the framework to capture real-world relationships without collapsing all domains into a single dimension.

Interdependence is acknowledged, but constrained. It does not eliminate the need to evaluate each domain independently, because the criteria governing each domain remain non-interchangeable.

4. Justification for Multiplicative Integration

The multiplicative structure used in WEP does not assume strict statistical independence. Instead, it reflects the principle that alignment across distinct evaluative dimensions is progressively more demanding.

A worldview that performs well across multiple domains must satisfy:

- predictive coherence
- anomaly integration
- knowledge generation
- historical manifestation
- experiential alignment

Even if these domains interact, success across all of them simultaneously is non-trivial. The multiplicative model captures this increasing constraint.

In this sense, multiplication functions as a representation of convergence pressure rather than a calculation of joint probability.

5. Avoiding Artificial Amplification

To prevent over-amplification of results due to interdependence, WEP incorporates the following safeguards:

- Domains are defined to minimize conceptual overlap
- Variables within each domain are normalized independently
- Interpretations emphasize relative comparison rather than absolute magnitude
- Order-of-magnitude outputs are treated as heuristic indicators

These constraints ensure that the model does not inflate results through redundant or overlapping inputs.

6. Interpretation of Convergence Under Interdependence

Under this framework, convergence is not interpreted as:

a probabilistic certainty derived from independent events

but as:

a structural alignment across distinct evaluative dimensions

This distinction is critical. Convergence gains significance not because the domains are unrelated, but because they remain meaningfully different in what they measure.

7. Implications for Framework Validity

By distinguishing between statistical independence and functional distinctness, WEP avoids two common errors:

- Treating interdependent domains as fully independent
- Collapsing distinct domains into a single evaluative axis

Instead, it maintains a structured balance:

- acknowledging real-world interactions
- preserving evaluative separation

This balance allows the framework to integrate multiple domains without sacrificing analytical clarity.

The role of independence within WEP is therefore constrained but not eliminated. Domains are not independent in a strict statistical sense, but they remain sufficiently distinct to justify their separate evaluation and integrated comparison. The multiplicative model reflects this structure, capturing convergence across dimensions without relying on unrealistic assumptions of isolation.

12

Nature of Quantification

Heuristic Formalization Within a Constrained Framework

A defining feature of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is its use of numerical representations to compare performance across domains. This introduces a critical methodological question:

What is the epistemic status of these numerical values?

If the values are interpreted as precise measurements, the framework risks overstating its certainty. If they are treated as purely subjective, the framework risks losing analytical force. WEP addresses this tension by positioning its quantitative structure as a form of constrained heuristic formalization.

1. The Measurement Problem

Unlike controlled scientific experiments, the domains evaluated within WEP involve complex, multi-layered phenomena:

- historical processes
- subjective human experience

- philosophical interpretation
- institutional development

These domains do not admit direct measurement in the same way as physical variables. There is no instrument that can assign an exact value to "experiential coherence" or "macro-historical impact."

Accordingly, WEP does not claim to produce exact measurements. Instead, it provides structured approximations grounded in defined criteria.

2. Heuristic Quantification Defined

Within WEP, quantification is understood as:

a structured method of translating qualitative assessments into comparable numerical forms under explicit constraints

This differs from arbitrary scoring in several key ways:

- Variables are explicitly defined (e.g., documentation, corroboration, explanatory gap)
- Scoring ranges are bounded and anchored to criteria
- Inputs are normalized across domains
- Calculations follow consistent mathematical rules

The goal is not precision in the absolute sense, but consistency and comparability.

3. Why Quantification Is Necessary

Without quantification, multi-domain evaluation faces a fundamental limitation:

- qualitative arguments remain isolated
- cross-domain comparison becomes ambiguous
- convergence cannot be formally represented

Quantification allows:

- aggregation of domain performance
- visualization of structural alignment
- identification of patterns across domains

In this sense, numerical representation is not an optional addition—it is required for integrating the framework into a unified system.

4. Constraint-Based Structure

To prevent arbitrariness, WEP imposes constraints on its quantitative layer:

(1) Defined Variable

Each index is composed of clearly defined components (e.g., D, C, E, R), limiting interpretive drift.

(2) Bounded Scales

All variables are normalized within fixed ranges (0–1), preventing uncontrolled scaling.

(3) Transparent Criteria

Scoring anchors are explicitly stated, allowing external evaluation and critique.

(4) Consistent Operations

All indices follow consistent multiplicative or averaging structures.

These constraints ensure that quantification is not free-form, but rule-governed.

5. Order-of-Magnitude Interpretation

WEP expresses results using order-of-magnitude approximations (e.g., 10^{-1}, 10^{-3}), rather than precise decimal claims.

This serves two purposes:

- it avoids false precision
- it emphasizes relative differences rather than exact values

A shift from 10^{-2} to 10^{-4} is interpreted as a significant structural difference, even if the exact numerical inputs are approximate.

6. Sensitivity and Variability

Because inputs are derived from interpretive assessment, WEP explicitly acknowledges sensitivity to:

- dataset selection
- evidentiary standards
- scoring thresholds

To address this, the framework emphasizes:

- range-based scoring rather than single-point estimates
- comparative analysis across worldviews
- reproducibility through transparent criteria

Different evaluators may produce slightly different values, but the structure of the model constrains how far those values can diverge.

7. Heuristic vs Probabilistic Interpretation

A critical clarification is required:

WEP outputs are not probabilities.

They do not represent:

- the likelihood that a worldview is true
- the probability of specific events

Instead, they represent:

the relative structural alignment of a worldview across multiple evaluative domains

The use of multiplicative combinations and exponential notation reflects convergence intensity, not statistical independence or probabilistic certainty.

8. Avoiding Pseudo-Precision

WEP avoids pseudo-precision by:

- explicitly stating the heuristic nature of its values
- using ranges and magnitudes rather than exact figures
- separating calculation from interpretation

This ensures that the framework remains analytically useful without over-claiming accuracy.

9. Implications for Interpretation

The quantitative layer of WEP should therefore be interpreted as:

- a structured comparison tool
- a convergence mapping system
- a formalized extension of qualitative analysis

It should not be interpreted as:

- a definitive measurement system
- a replacement for domain-specific analysis
- a proof in the strict mathematical sense

10. Summary Position

Quantification within WEP occupies an intermediate position between purely qualitative reasoning and strict scientific measurement.

It is:

- more structured than narrative comparison
- less precise than experimental data

This intermediate position is not a limitation, but a necessary feature of any framework that seeks to integrate diverse domains of human knowledge and experience into a unified evaluative model.

The role of quantification in WEP is therefore to impose structure, enable comparison, and represent convergence, while remaining explicitly constrained and epistemically transparent. This preserves both analytical rigor and methodological honesty.

13

Comparator Selection: Scope, Representativeness, and Structural Contrast

A critical component of any comparative evaluative framework is the justification of the systems being compared. Without a clear rationale for comparator selection, the analysis risks appearing selectively constructed to produce a desired outcome.

Accordingly, the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) explicitly addresses the question:

Why compare Christianity and Naturalism?

1. The Comparator Selection Problem

In principle, WEP could be applied to a wide range of worldviews, including:

- theistic traditions
- non-theistic religions
- philosophical systems

- secular or scientific frameworks

However, exhaustive comparison across all possible systems is not required to establish the validity of the framework. Instead, WEP begins with a pair of comparators that satisfy three criteria:

- Representativeness
- Structural contrast
- Global relevance

2. Representativeness

Christianity and Naturalism are selected because they represent two of the most influential and widely adopted frameworks for interpreting reality.

- Christianity functions as a historically dominant theistic system with global reach, extensive documentation, and long-term institutional presence.
- Naturalism functions as a foundational framework underlying modern scientific inquiry, secular philosophy, and contemporary explanatory models of reality.

Together, they capture two broad categories:

- transcendence-inclusive systems
- immanence-restricted systems

This makes them suitable anchors for comparative analysis.

3. Structural Contrast

The selected comparators exhibit deep structural differences across multiple dimensions:

- Ontology
- Christianity affirms a reality that includes both material and non-material dimensions
- Naturalism restricts reality to material or physical processes
- Epistemology
- Christianity incorporates revelation, historical testimony, and experiential data
- Naturalism prioritizes empirical observation and repeatable experimentation
- Explanatory Scope
- Christianity allows for supernatural causation
- Naturalism excludes non-natural explanations by definition

This level of contrast ensures that differences observed across WEP domains are not superficial, but structurally significant.

4. Global Relevance

Both Christianity and Naturalism exert significant influence on contemporary global systems:

- Christianity through religious institutions, cultural frameworks, and historical continuity
- Naturalism through science, technology, education, and secular governance

Their interaction shapes major aspects of modern society, including:

- scientific development
- ethical systems
- political structures
- cultural identity

This makes the comparison not only theoretically relevant, but practically consequential.

5. Baseline Comparison Strategy

WEP employs a baseline comparison approach:

- Christianity represents a comprehensive theistic framework
- Naturalism represents a comprehensive non-theistic framework

By comparing these two, the framework establishes an initial contrast across major categories of worldview structure.

This does not imply that other systems are excluded. Rather, it provides a starting point that can be extended to additional worldviews in future applications.

6. Avoiding Selection Bias

To mitigate concerns of selection bias, WEP does not assume that either comparator will perform better across all domains.

In fact, the framework is structured to allow for divergence:

- a worldview may perform strongly in knowledge production while performing weakly in experiential coherence
- another may perform strongly in historical impact but weakly in predictive power

The comparative structure is therefore open-ended, not outcome-driven.

7. Generalizability

The methodology underlying WEP is not limited to Christianity and Naturalism. The same domain structure, criteria, and scoring protocols can be applied to:

- other religious traditions
- hybrid philosophical systems
- alternative metaphysical frameworks

The initial comparison serves as a demonstration of the framework's functionality, not its limitation.

8. Implications for Interpretation

The selection of Christianity and Naturalism should therefore be understood as:

- a representative contrast between major categories of worldview
- a structurally informative comparison
- a baseline application of a broader evaluative method

It should not be interpreted as:

- an exclusive or exhaustive evaluation
- a restriction of the framework's applicability
- a predetermined outcome based on comparator choice

9. Summary Position

Comparator selection within WEP is guided by representativeness, structural contrast, and global relevance. Christianity and Naturalism satisfy these criteria, making them appropriate initial subjects for analysis.

The resulting comparison is therefore not a product of selective framing,

but an application of the framework to two of the most influential and structurally distinct systems available.

By grounding comparator selection in explicit criteria, WEP reinforces its methodological neutrality while preserving its capacity to generate meaningful comparative insights across domains.

14

Scope and Limits of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol

Any comprehensive evaluative framework must clearly define not only what it measures, but also what it does not claim to determine. Without such clarification, the framework risks being interpreted as making stronger claims than its methodology can support.

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) therefore explicitly defines its scope and limitations.

1. Scope of the Framework

WEP is designed to evaluate worldviews across multiple domains of interaction with reality, including:

- predictive structure
- anomalous phenomena
- knowledge production
- macro-historical impact
- experiential coherence

Within these domains, WEP assesses:

the degree of structural alignment between a worldview and observed features of reality:

- defined criteria
- normalized variables
- comparative scoring
- cross-domain integration

The framework is therefore intended to function as:

a structured method for comparing how different worldviews perform across multiple dimensions of reality engagement

2. What WEP Does Not Claim

To maintain methodological clarity, WEP does not claim the following:

(1) Direct Proof of Truth

WEP does not prove that any worldview is true in an absolute or metaphysical sense. It does not establish certainty regarding ultimate reality or causation.

(2) Causal Determination

The framework does not determine the underlying causes of observed phenomena. For example, it does not establish whether anomalous events are genuinely supernatural or whether historical outcomes are exclusively attributable to a single worldview.

(3) Precise Measurement

WEP does not provide exact quantitative measurements. Its numerical outputs are heuristic approximations, not empirically precise values.

(4) Exhaustive Evaluation of All Worldviews

The current application focuses on selected comparators. While the framework is generalizable, it does not claim to have evaluated every possible worldview.

(5) Moral or Ethical Judgment

WEP does not evaluate whether the outcomes associated with a worldview are morally good or bad. It measures scale, coherence, and impact, not ethical value.

3. What WEP Does Claim

While its claims are constrained, WEP does make specific, defensible assertions:

(1) Comparative Structural Assessment

WEP provides a systematic method for comparing how worldviews perform across multiple independent domains.

(2) Convergence Identification

It identifies cases in which a worldview exhibits alignment across multiple evaluative dimensions simultaneously.

(3) Constraint-Based Evaluation

By requiring performance across distinct domains, WEP introduces a form

of constraint that reduces the likelihood of superficial or one-dimensional success.

(4) Transparent Methodology

All variables, criteria, and calculations are explicitly defined, allowing for replication, critique, and refinement.

4. Interpretation of Results

Results generated by WEP should be interpreted as:

indicators of relative structural alignment across domains

They should not be interpreted as:

- definitive proof
- probabilistic certainty
- exclusive validation of a single worldview

Instead, higher convergence indicates that a worldview:

- accounts for a broader range of observed phenomena
- maintains coherence across distinct evaluative categories
- exhibits structural consistency under multiple forms of analysis

5. The Role of Convergence

Within WEP, convergence refers to:

the alignment of a worldview across multiple functionally distinct domains

The significance of convergence arises not from mathematical independence,

but from:

the increasing difficulty of satisfying multiple evaluative constraints simultaneously

A worldview that performs strongly across all domains demonstrates a form of structural robustness. However, this robustness remains an evaluative observation, not a metaphysical conclusion.

6. Limits of Interpretation

Several limitations affect the interpretation of WEP results:

- sensitivity to input selection and scoring
- dependence on available data
- variation in interpretive frameworks
- potential disagreement on domain weighting

These limitations do not invalidate the framework, but they constrain the strength of its conclusions.

7. Position Within Broader Inquiry

WEP is best understood as one component within a larger process of worldview evaluation, which may also include:

- philosophical argumentation
- empirical investigation
- historical analysis
- personal or experiential reflection

It does not replace these methods, but integrates aspects of them into a unified comparative structure.

8. Summary Position

WEP operates as a structured, multi-domain comparative framework that evaluates the alignment of worldviews with different aspects of reality.

Its conclusions are:

- comparative rather than absolute
- structured rather than purely narrative
- constrained rather than unlimited

By explicitly defining its scope and limits, WEP maintains methodological integrity while preserving its capacity to generate meaningful insights across domains.

The strength of WEP lies not in claiming more than it can support, but in clearly defining the boundaries within which its conclusions remain valid. This constraint enhances, rather than diminishes, the credibility of the framework.

15

Calibration and Sensitivity Analysis: Stability Under Variation

A central challenge for any multi-domain evaluative framework is ensuring that its conclusions are not overly dependent on specific input choices. Because the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) relies on normalized variables and heuristic scoring, it is necessary to examine how sensitive its outputs are to variation in those inputs.

This section introduces calibration and sensitivity analysis as mechanisms for testing the robustness of the framework.

1. Purpose of Calibration

Calibration serves two primary functions:

- Consistency Control — ensuring that scoring reflects comparable standards across domains
- Result Stability — assessing whether small changes in input values produce disproportionate changes in outcomes

Without calibration, a framework risks producing results that are artifacts

of scoring assumptions rather than reflections of underlying structure.

2. Sensitivity to Input Variation

Each domain index within WEP is calculated using normalized variables (e.g., D, C, E, R; F, S, I, E; etc.). Because these variables are derived from structured assessment rather than direct measurement, they are subject to variation across evaluators.

To evaluate sensitivity, we consider controlled perturbations of input values.

2.1 Local Sensitivity (Single-Variable Adjustment)

Let an index be defined as:

$I \approx (x_1 \times x_2 \times x_3 \times x_4)$

If one variable changes by a factor Δ, the resulting change in I is proportional to Δ.

Example:

- Original: $0.8 \times 0.7 \times 0.8 \times 0.7 \approx 0.3136$
- Adjust one variable downward:
- $0.8 \times 0.6 \times 0.8 \times 0.7 \approx 0.2688$

Change $\approx -14.3\%$

This demonstrates that:

- The model is sensitive to input variation
- But not catastrophically unstable under moderate changes

2.2 Multi-Variable Perturbation

When multiple variables are adjusted simultaneously, the effect compounds:

- Small decreases across all variables reduce the index multiplicatively
- Small increases across all variables increase it similarly

This behavior reflects the intended design:

The framework penalizes weak performance across multiple dimensions more strongly than isolated variation.

3. Range-Based Stability

To address variability, WEP uses **range-based scoring** rather than fixed-point values.

Example:

- Christianity (Domain 2): 6.5 – 8.5
- Naturalism (Domain 2): 2.0 – 4.5

Even under reasonable variation:

- The ranges do not significantly overlap
- Relative ordering remains stable

This indicates that conclusions are not dependent on a single precise value, but on broader structural differences.

4. Order-of-Magnitude Robustness

Because WEP interprets results using order-of-magnitude scales (e.g., 10^{-1} vs 10^{-3}), sensitivity must be evaluated at that level.

Key observation:

- Moderate input variation typically shifts results within the same order of magnitude
- Large structural differences are required to move a system across magnitude thresholds

This creates a form of **robustness buffer**, where:

minor disagreements in scoring do not alter high-level conclusions

5. Cross-Domain Stability

Sensitivity must also be evaluated across domains.

Even if a worldview's score in one domain is adjusted:

- its performance in other domains remains independently assessed
- convergence requires consistent performance across all domains

This means that:
a change in one domain rarely overturns the overall convergence pattern

6. Calibration Strategies

To improve reliability, WEP can be calibrated using the following methods:

(1) Multi-Evaluator Averaging

- Independent scoring by multiple evaluators
- Aggregation of results to reduce individual bias

(2) Benchmark Case Sets

- Use of known or widely studied cases
- Establishing reference points for scoring consistency

(3) Cross-Framework Comparison

- Comparing WEP outputs with existing qualitative analyses
- Identifying alignment or divergence

(4) Iterative Refinement

- Updating scoring criteria as new data becomes available
- Adjusting variable definitions to improve clarity

7. Stress-Test Scenarios

To evaluate robustness, WEP can be subjected to stress-test scenarios:

- **Optimistic Scoring for Comparator A / Conservative for B**
- **Uniform Downward Adjustment Across All Domains**
- **Selective Reduction of High-Scoring Domains**

If convergence persists under these conditions, confidence in structural alignment increases.

8. Limitations of Sensitivity Analysis

While calibration improves reliability, certain limitations remain:

- Input values are still interpretive
- Complete objectivity is not achievable
- Data availability varies across domains

These limitations are acknowledged and incorporated into the framework's

interpretation guidelines.

9. Interpretation of Stability

A stable result within WEP is defined as:

a convergence pattern that persists across reasonable ranges of input variation

This definition shifts the focus from:

exact numerical outputs

to:

structural consistency under changing assumptions

10. Summary Position

Calibration and sensitivity analysis demonstrate that WEP is:

- responsive to input variation
- resistant to minor scoring differences
- dependent on broad structural patterns rather than precise values

This balance ensures that the framework remains both flexible and stable.

The inclusion of calibration and sensitivity analysis strengthens WEP by showing that its conclusions are not artifacts of arbitrary scoring, but reflections of underlying patterns that persist under variation. This moves the framework from a conceptual model toward a testable and iteratively refinable system.

16

Convergence Visualization

Multi-Domain Alignment Mapping

To complement the quantitative structure of WEP, a visual representation of cross-domain performance is introduced. This serves two purposes:

- to provide an intuitive overview of domain-level alignment
- to illustrate convergence across functionally distinct evaluative dimensions

1. Visualization Structure

The convergence model is represented as a five-axis radial framework, with each axis corresponding to one domain:

- Predictive Power (PCCRI)
- Anomalous Events (AEI)
- Knowledge Production (IDCRI)
- Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)
- Experiential Coherence (ECRI)

Each worldview is plotted as a closed shape across these axes, using

normalized values (0–1 scale).

2. Interpretation of Shape

The resulting geometric pattern encodes structural information:

- Area Coverage → overall cross-domain strength
- Symmetry → balance across domains
- Distortion → domain-specific strengths and weaknesses

A worldview that performs strongly across all domains produces:

- a large, well-balanced shape
- indicating high convergence

A worldview with uneven performance produces:

- an irregular or compressed shape
- indicating domain-specific limitations

3. Illustrative Mapping (Normalized Values)

Christianity (approximate midpoints):

- PCCRI ≈ 0.8
- AEI ≈ 0.75
- IDCRI ≈ 0.78
- HIRI ≈ 0.9
- ECRI ≈ 0.85

Naturalism (approximate midpoints):

- PCCRI ≈ 0.7

- AEI ≈ 0.35
- IDCRI ≈ 0.83
- HIRI ≈ 0.78
- ECRI ≈ 0.63

4. Visual Insight

When plotted:

- Christianity produces a **high-area, relatively balanced structure**
- Naturalism produces a **strong but uneven structure**, with reduced coverage in anomaly handling and experiential coherence

This visualization reinforces a central result of WEP:

Convergence is not determined by peak performance in a single domain, but by sustained alignment across multiple domains simultaneously.

5. Analytical Value

The convergence map provides:

- a rapid comparative overview
- a diagnostic tool for identifying domain gaps
- a bridge between qualitative interpretation and quantitative structure

It allows both specialists and non-specialists to grasp the core result without requiring full engagement with the underlying equations.

6. Limitations

The visualization is:

- dependent on normalized inputs
- sensitive to scaling choices
- illustrative rather than definitive

It should therefore be interpreted as a structural representation, not a precise measurement.

7. Summary Position

The convergence visualization functions as a complementary layer within WEP, translating multi-domain evaluation into a unified geometric representation.

It makes visible what the mathematical structure encodes:

that convergence across distinct domains produces a form of structural alignment that is both measurable and interpretable.

17

Illustrative References to Additional Worldviews

Throughout this work, occasional references may be made to worldviews beyond the primary comparison between Christianity and Naturalism (e.g., Buddhism, Islam, or other philosophical systems).

These references serve a limited and specific purpose:

- to demonstrate the extensibility of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP)
- to illustrate how the same evaluative criteria could be applied across different systems
- to provide conceptual contrast where relevant to a specific domain

They are **not intended as full evaluations**, nor as comprehensive or final comparative judgments.

A complete application of WEP to any additional worldview would require:

- domain-by-domain analysis under identical criteria
- transparent variable definitions and scoring justification

- full integration into the convergence model

Because such analysis is not carried out in this work, any references to other worldviews should be interpreted as:

illustrative rather than evaluative

This distinction is essential to maintaining methodological neutrality.

The framework itself remains fully open to future application across a broader range of worldviews, where each system can be evaluated with equal rigour under the same structured methodology.

- Extended Comparator Analysis: Buddhism (Pilot Application)
- To demonstrate the generalizability of WEP beyond a single comparison, a secondary worldview is introduced as a pilot extension.
- This section applies the framework in abbreviated form to Buddhism, not as a full evaluation, but as a proof-of-concept for cross-system applicability.

1. Rationale for Inclusion

- Buddhism is selected due to:

1. its global historical presence
2. its non-theistic metaphysical structure
3. its emphasis on experiential and philosophical analysis
4. This makes it a useful comparator alongside both Christianity and Naturalism.

2. Domain-Level Overview (Abbreviated)

- **Predictive Power (PCCRI)**

1. Strong internal predictive framework (e.g., suffering, impermanence)
2. Limited emphasis on externally verifiable predictive claims
3. → Approximate: Moderate–High (≈ 0.7)

- **Anomalous Events (AEI)**

1. Includes accounts of transcendent or altered states of consciousness
2. Less emphasis on historically structured documentation
3. → Approximate: Moderate (≈ 0.5)

- **Knowledge Production (IDCRI)**

1. Strong philosophical and introspective traditions
2. More limited emphasis on large-scale empirical scientific infrastructure
3. → Approximate: Moderate (≈ 0.6)

- **Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)**

1. Significant regional and civilizational influence
2. Less emphasis on globally unified institutional expansion
3. → Approximate: Moderate–High (≈ 0.7)

- **Experiential Coherence (ECRI)**

1. Strong alignment with subjective experience
2. Extensive introspective and psychological frameworks
3. → Approximate: High (≈ 0.85)

- **3. Convergence Pattern**

1. When mapped across domains, Buddhism exhibits:
2. strong experiential coherence
3. moderate performance across multiple domains

4. a distribution that is more concentrated in experiential and philosophical dimensions than in large-scale institutional or scientific systems

This produces:

a relatively balanced but differently distributed convergence profile

4. Interpretive Insight

The inclusion of Buddhism demonstrates that:

- WEP can be applied across fundamentally different metaphysical systems
- different worldviews exhibit distinct convergence patterns
- no single domain determines overall alignment

5. Methodological Significance

- This pilot comparison serves to:

1. validate the generalizability of WEP
2. reduce concerns of comparator restriction
3. illustrate how additional systems can be incorporated

- A full evaluation would require:

1. expanded datasets
2. detailed scoring
3. domain-level analysis equivalent to primary comparators

6. Summary Position

- The inclusion of a secondary comparator confirms that WEP is not limited to binary comparison, but is extensible to a broader range of

worldviews.
- This reinforces the framework's role as a general evaluative system rather than a single-case application.

Extended Comparator Analysis: Islam (Secondary Application)

To further demonstrate the applicability of WEP across major global worldviews, a secondary comparator is introduced. This section applies the framework in abbreviated form to Islam, providing an additional illustration of cross-domain evaluation.

1. Rationale for Inclusion

Islam is included due to:

1. its global demographic significance
2. its strong historical civilizational influence
3. its structured theological and legal framework
4. This makes it a suitable comparator alongside Christianity and Naturalism.

2. Domain-Level Overview (Abbreviated)

- **Predictive Power (PCCRI)**

1. Contains structured theological and eschatological claims
2. Less emphasis on predictive specificity in empirical or externally testable domains
3. → Approximate: Moderate (≈ 0.65–0.75)

- **Anomalous Events (AEI)**

1. Includes miracle traditions and supernatural accounts
2. Documentation varies in form, structure, and standardization
3. → Approximate: Moderate (≈ 0.5–0.7)

- **Knowledge Production (IDCRI)**

1. Strong historical contributions (e.g., Islamic Golden Age)
2. Significant philosophical and scientific engagement
3. Variation in modern global scientific dominance across regions
4. → Approximate: Moderate–High (≈ 0.6–0.75)

- **Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)**

1. Major civilizational influence across multiple regions
2. Long-duration cultural, legal, and institutional systems
3. → Approximate: High (≈ 0.75–0.85)

- **Experiential Coherence (ECRI)**

1. Provides structured moral, existential, and religious framework
2. Strong integration of meaning and practice
3. → Approximate: High (≈ 0.75–0.85)

3. Convergence Pattern

When mapped across domains, Islam exhibits:

1. strong macro-historical and experiential coherence
2. moderate performance in predictive and anomaly domains
3. stable but differently distributed knowledge production in modern global contexts
4. This produces:
5. a moderately strong but non-uniform convergence profile

4. Comparative Insight

The inclusion of Islam highlights several key observations:

multiple worldviews can exhibit strong convergence across several domains

differences often emerge in:

1. predictive structure
2. anomaly integration
3. knowledge system scaling

This reinforces that:

WEP evaluates degrees of convergence, not binary outcomes.

5. Methodological Significance

This additional comparator demonstrates that:

1. WEP is not limited to a single worldview pairing
2. the framework can be extended across major global systems
3. comparative outcomes remain sensitive to domain-level variation

6. Summary Position

The inclusion of Islam confirms the broader applicability of WEP and strengthens its position as a general evaluative framework.

It demonstrates that:

1. convergence varies across systems
2. no single domain determines overall alignment

3. full evaluation requires multi-domain integration

18

Methodological Safeguards

Independence, Weighting, and Falsifiability

To ensure that the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) maintains epistemic rigor, three critical safeguards are required: domain independence clarification, weighting flexibility, and explicit falsifiability conditions. These elements prevent overinterpretation, strengthen methodological transparency, and align the framework with accepted standards of academic evaluation.

1. Domain Independence and Correlation Adjustment

1.1 Independence Assumption

WEP evaluates worldviews across multiple domains that are functionally distinct but not strictly independent. While each domain captures a different dimension of explanatory scope—predictive, anomalous, intellectual, historical, and experiential—there are areas of partial overlap.

For example:

- Anomalous events (Domain 2) may intersect with experiential reports

(Domain 5)
- Knowledge production (Domain 3) may influence macro-historical impact (Domain 4)

As such, WEP operates under an assumption of partial independence, not full statistical independence.

1.2 Correlation Implications

If domains were fully independent, convergence across them would represent a stronger form of evidential compounding. However, due to partial correlation:

- Convergence must be interpreted conservatively
- Cross-domain reinforcement is attenuated, not multiplied without constraint

1.3 Conservative Interpretation Rule

To maintain rigor, WEP adopts the following interpretive principle:

Convergence across domains is treated as structurally significant, but not as a strict probabilistic multiplication of independent variables.

This ensures that:

- Overlapping data sources do not artificially inflate results
- The framework remains resistant to correlation-based inflation

1.4 Optional Correlation Dampening (Extended Form)

For advanced implementations, a dampening factor may be introduced:

$WCS \approx (PCCRI \times AEI \times IDCRI \times HIRI \times ECRI)^k$

Where:

- $k \in (0,1)$ represents a correlation-adjustment coefficient
- Lower values of k reflect higher assumed interdependence

This allows the model to be tuned based on stricter independence assumptions.

2. Domain Weighting Framework

2.1 Default Equal Weight Model (EWM)

In its base form, WEP assigns equal weight to each domain:

- Predictive Power (PCCRI)
- Anomalous Events (AEI)
- Knowledge Production (IDCRI)
- Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)
- Experiential Coherence (ECRI)

This produces a neutral baseline:

Each domain contributes equally to overall convergence.

2.2 Justification

The equal-weight model is justified as a starting point because:

- No universally accepted hierarchy exists across epistemic domains
- Different philosophical traditions prioritize different forms of evidence
- Equal weighting avoids embedding implicit bias into the framework

2.3 Alternative Weighting Schemes

WEP is intentionally extensible. Researchers may apply alternative weighting structures depending on epistemic priorities.

Examples include:

Empirical Priority Model

- Higher weight on:
- Predictive Power (PCCRI)
- Knowledge Production (IDCRI)

Experiential Priority Model

- Higher weight on:
- Experiential Coherence (ECRI)
- Anomalous Events (AEI)

Historical Priority Model

- Higher weight on:
- Macro-Historical Impact (HIRI)

2.4 General Weighted Form

$WCS \approx PCCRI^{w_1} \times AEI^{w_2} \times IDCRI^{w_3} \times HIRI^{w_4} \times ECRI^{w_5}$

Where:

$w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 1$

weights reflect epistemic emphasis

2.5 Interpretive Role

The inclusion of weighting:

- Does not change domain scores
- Alters how convergence is aggregated

This transforms WEP from a fixed model into a:

Configurable evaluation framework adaptable to different philosophical commitments.

3. Falsifiability Conditions

3.1 Necessity of Falsifiability

For WEP to function as a legitimate evaluative framework, it must include conditions under which its conclusions can be challenged or weakened.

Without falsifiability, the model risks becoming:

- Self-confirming
- Epistemically closed

3.2 Structural Falsifiability Criteria

WEP would be weakened under the following conditions:

(1) Domain Collapse

- If stricter evidentiary standards reduce scores significantly across multiple domains

(2) Asymmetric Dominance

- If a competing worldview demonstrates consistently higher performance across the majority of domains

(3) Convergence Failure

- If high scores in isolated domains do not produce meaningful cross-domain alignment

(4) Replication Breakdown

- If independent applications of WEP produce widely inconsistent results using similar datasets

3.3 Data Sensitivity

WEP is sensitive to:

- Dataset selection
- Evidence thresholds
- Scoring calibration

Therefore:

Changes in input data should produce corresponding changes in output.

This ensures that the model remains:

- Responsive
- Testable
- Open to revision

3.4 Non-Falsifiable Boundaries (Clarification)

WEP does not attempt to falsify:

- The truth of a worldview
- The existence of metaphysical entities

Instead, it evaluates:

The degree of cross-domain explanatory alignment.

4. Summary Position

The inclusion of independence clarification, weighting flexibility, and falsifiability conditions transforms WEP from a structural framework into a methodologically robust system.

These safeguards ensure that:

- Convergence is not overstated
- Evaluation remains adaptable
- Conclusions remain open to challenge

Together, they establish WEP as:

A transparent, adjustable, and testable protocol for comparative worldview analysis.

19

Unified Convergence Model: Formal Expression of WEP

To consolidate the multi-domain structure of the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP), a unified convergence expression is introduced. This provides a formal representation of how domain-level evaluations combine into an overall structural assessment.

1. Core Convergence Equation

The WEP Convergence Score (WCS) is defined as:

$$WCS \approx PCCRI \times AEI \times IDCRI \times HIRI \times ECRI$$

Where:

- PCCRI → Predictive Power (Domain 1)
- AEI → Anomalous Events (Domain 2)
- IDCRI → Knowledge Production (Domain 3)
- HIRI → Macro-Historical Impact (Domain 4)
- ECRI → Experiential Coherence (Domain 5)

2. Interpretation of the Expression

The multiplicative structure reflects a key principle:

Convergence requires simultaneous performance across independent dimensions.

In this model:

- A low score in any domain reduces overall convergence
- High convergence requires consistent strength across all domains

3. Non-Probabilistic Clarification

This equation is not intended to represent:

- statistical probability
- empirical likelihood
- formal Bayesian inference

Instead, it functions as:

A structured aggregation of normalized evaluative scores.

Thus:

- The WCS represents **convergence density**, not probability
- The expression is **heuristic in form, not statistical in claim**

4. Correlation Adjustment (Integrated Form)

Given partial domain dependence, the convergence expression may be adjusted:

$$WCS \approx (PCCRI \times AEI \times IDCRI \times HIRI \times ECRI)^k$$

Where:

- $k \in (0,1)$ represents correlation dampening
- Lower k values reflect greater assumed interdependence

This preserves the structure while preventing over-amplification.

5. Weighted Convergence Form

For applications requiring epistemic prioritization:

$$WCS \approx PCCRI^{w_1} \times AEI^{w_2} \times IDCRI^{w_3} \times HIRI^{w_4} \times ECRI^{w_5}$$

Subject to:

$$w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 = 1$$

This allows:

- domain prioritization
- philosophical flexibility
- comparative sensitivity analysis

6. Structural Meaning of Convergence

Within WEP, convergence is defined as:

The degree to which a worldview maintains consistent explanatory performance across multiple independent domains.

This shifts evaluation away from:

- isolated arguments
- toward:
- system-level coherence

7. Limiting Cases

The convergence model produces distinct structural outcomes:

- High convergence → strong multi-domain alignment
- Partial convergence → domain-specific strengths with gaps
- Low convergence → fragmented or inconsistent explanatory structure

8. Summary Position

The unified convergence equation serves as the formal core of WEP, integrating domain-level analysis into a single structural expression.

It provides:

- conceptual clarity
- analytical consistency
- a repeatable evaluation mechanism

While remaining:

- non-probabilistic
- adaptable
- methodologically transparent

20

Convergence Threshold and Interpretive Constraint

A central question within WEP is not merely whether convergence occurs, but when such convergence becomes epistemically significant.

Individual domains may admit multiple interpretations. Disagreement at the domain level is expected and does not invalidate the framework. However, the probability that multiple independent or partially independent domains will align in the same direction decreases with increasing domain number.

WEP does not treat convergence as automatic confirmation. Instead, it introduces a threshold-based interpretive principle:

Convergence becomes epistemically significant when alignment persists across domains that:

- rely on different datasets
- operate under different methodologies
- and are not reducible to a single underlying variable

This threshold does not produce certainty, but it does impose a constraint.

Below the threshold:

- divergence is expected
- multiple explanations remain equally viable

At the threshold:

- convergence begins to require explanation

Beyond the threshold:

- dismissal of convergence requires additional assumptions
- explanatory burden shifts from the framework to competing models

This principle reframes the role of evidence within WEP:

The framework does not claim that any single domain proves a worldview.

It instead evaluates whether:

the sustained alignment of multiple domains under a single explanatory system is more plausibly accounted for by that system than by independent or competing explanations.

This establishes convergence not as proof, but as:

a structural constraint on plausible interpretation.

21

Author Position and Epistemic Posture

This work is developed within a context in which the author holds a prior commitment to the plausibility of Christianity as a comprehensive explanatory framework. This starting point is not concealed, but explicitly acknowledged as part of the intellectual context in which the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is constructed and applied.

However, the purpose of WEP is not to assume the truth of any worldview, but to establish a structured method for evaluating competing systems based on their performance across multiple domains of inquiry.

Accordingly, the framework is designed to meet the following conditions:

- It must be applicable to any worldview without structural modification
- It must allow, in principle, for outcomes that differ from the author's prior expectations
- It must remain responsive to changes in evidentiary standards and dataset selection

This distinction is critical. The author's position motivates the investigation, but does not determine its outcome. The framework itself is intended to function independently of any single conclusion.

To maintain this separation, WEP is constructed such that:

- domain definitions are derived from broad categories of human inquiry rather than tailored to any single worldview
- scoring criteria are applied consistently across all evaluated systems
- objections are incorporated symmetrically, including those that challenge the preferred conclusion
- outcomes are interpreted comparatively rather than as absolute determinations

In this sense, WEP is not presented as a mechanism for confirming prior belief, but as a structured attempt to evaluate explanatory scope under transparent and repeatable conditions.

If the framework is applied rigorously and produces results that diverge from the author's expectations under stricter evidentiary constraints or broader comparative datasets, those results should be taken seriously. The validity of the framework depends on its ability to remain open to revision.

The goal of this work, therefore, is not to eliminate commitment, but to discipline it—by subjecting it to a method that is capable, in principle, of challenging the very position from which it was developed.

While this work has focused on establishing a framework for evaluating reality across independent domains, the natural next step is application.

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol is not tied to any single system. Its purpose is comparative.

However, when applied in full, certain systems exhibit levels of cross-domain convergence that warrant deeper examination.

A full application of this framework to a specific historical and theological

system is explored in *Proving Christianity* by Tyler Leroux.

That work moves from method to case study.

22

Limitations and Critiques

While the Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is designed to provide a structured and multi-domain framework for comparative analysis, it is subject to several important limitations. These limitations do not invalidate the framework, but define the conditions under which its results must be interpreted.

1. Heuristic Nature of Quantification

WEP employs mathematical structure to organize and integrate domain-level evaluations. However, these expressions are not intended to represent formal statistical probabilities.

The indices used throughout the framework (e.g., PCCRI, AEI, IDCRI, HIRI, ECRI) are:

- normalized evaluative constructs
- dependent on qualitative-to-quantitative translation
- sensitive to scoring interpretation

As such:

The numerical outputs of WEP should be understood as structured comparative indicators rather than precise probabilistic measurements.

This limitation reflects the broader challenge of quantifying complex, cross-domain phenomena that include historical, experiential, and philosophical components.

2. Domain Selection and Framing

The five domains used in WEP represent broad categories of human inquiry:

- prediction
- anomaly
- knowledge production
- historical impact
- experiential coherence

However, the selection and framing of these domains may be contested.

Critics may argue that:

- alternative domains could be included
- existing domains could be defined differently
- certain domains may carry implicit philosophical assumptions

In response, WEP maintains that:

These domains are intended to capture major, recurring dimensions through which humans evaluate reality, rather than to privilege any specific worldview.

Nevertheless, the possibility of domain-level bias remains a legitimate consideration.

3. Partial Dependence Between Domains

Although WEP evaluates multiple domains separately, these domains are not strictly independent.

Examples of overlap include:

- anomalous events and experiential reports
- knowledge production and historical impact

This introduces the possibility of:

- correlation between domain scores
- partial reuse of underlying data

To address this, WEP adopts a conservative interpretive approach:

- convergence is treated as structurally significant, not statistically multiplicative
- optional correlation dampening may be applied

Even with these safeguards, complete independence cannot be assumed.

4. Scoring Subjectivity and Calibration

The assignment of domain scores requires:

- interpretation of evidence
- evaluation of documentation quality
- judgment of explanatory adequacy

This introduces a degree of subjectivity.

While WEP mitigates this through:

- defined criteria
- scoring anchors
- tiered evidence classification

Variability may still arise between different evaluators.

Accordingly:

Reproducibility depends on transparent methodology, not identical scoring outcomes.

Future applications may benefit from:

- multi-evaluator scoring
- inter-rater reliability analysis
- standardized datasets

5. Comparator Scope and Selection

The present application of WEP focuses on a limited number of worldviews, including:

- Christianity
- Naturalism
- selected secondary comparators

This creates a scope limitation.

The results presented should therefore be understood as:

Illustrative rather than exhaustive.

A full validation of WEP would require:

- broader worldview inclusion
- cross-cultural dataset expansion
- repeated application across independent analyses

6. Epistemic Framework Dependence

WEP evaluates worldviews across multiple domains, including:

- empirical
- historical
- experiential
- philosophical

However, not all epistemological frameworks accept the legitimacy of all domains.

For example:

- strict empiricist positions may reject experiential or anomalous data
- purely subjectivist frameworks may reject predictive or empirical constraints

As a result:

The applicability of WEP depends, in part, on a willingness to engage multiple forms of evidence.

This does not invalidate the framework, but places it within a broader epistemic context.

7. Distinction Between Explanatory Power and Truth

WEP evaluates:

- explanatory scope
- cross-domain coherence
- structural convergence

It does not establish:

- metaphysical certainty
- ontological truth
- causal finality

Therefore:

High convergence within WEP should be interpreted as strong explanatory alignment, not definitive proof of truth.

This distinction is essential to prevent overextension of the framework's conclusions.

8. Sensitivity to Evidence Standards

WEP results are sensitive to:

- evidentiary thresholds
- inclusion criteria
- definitions of credibility

Changes in these factors may:

- increase or decrease domain scores
- alter comparative outcomes

This sensitivity is not a flaw, but a feature:

It ensures that the framework remains responsive to new data and evolving standards.

9. Risk of Misapplication

If improperly applied, WEP may be:

- reduced to numerical formalism without methodological discipline
- used to reinforce prior conclusions without symmetrical evaluation
- interpreted as a deterministic or closed system

Such uses would undermine the purpose of the framework.

Proper application requires:

- transparency
- consistency
- willingness to engage counter-evidence

10. Summary Position

The limitations outlined above do not negate the value of WEP, but define its proper use.

WEP is best understood as:

- a structured comparative framework
- a multi-domain evaluative system
- a method for organizing complex evidence

Its conclusions should be interpreted within these boundaries.

When applied carefully, WEP provides:

- a transparent method of comparison
- a way to integrate diverse forms of evidence
- a structured approach to evaluating explanatory coherence across domains

But like all frameworks operating at this level of abstraction:

its strength depends on the rigor with which it is applied.

23

Scope and Generalizability of the Framework

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol (WEP) is presented not as a single-case argument, but as a generalizable evaluative framework intended for application across a wide range of worldview systems.

While the present work applies WEP to a specific set of comparators, this application should be understood as:

An initial demonstration rather than a comprehensive evaluation.

1. Scope of Application

WEP is designed to be applicable to any worldview that makes claims about reality, including but not limited to:

- theistic systems
- non-theistic philosophical frameworks
- naturalistic or materialist models
- hybrid or pluralistic systems

The only requirement for inclusion is that a system:

- produces claims that can be evaluated across one or more domains
- engages with at least some aspect of human experience, knowledge, or reality

2. Domain Extensibility

Although WEP is currently structured around five primary domains:

- Predictive Power
- Anomalous Events
- Knowledge Production
- Macro-Historical Impact
- Experiential Coherence

these domains are not necessarily exhaustive.

Future extensions of the framework may include:

- ethical outcome analysis
- aesthetic or cultural valuation
- social stability metrics
- additional epistemic or metaphysical dimensions

This allows WEP to remain:

open-ended and adaptable to further refinement.

3. Dataset Expansion

The conclusions presented in this work are based on:

- selected datasets
- representative examples
- illustrative scoring models

A fully developed application of WEP would require:

- larger-scale datasets
- cross-cultural analysis
- longitudinal evaluation across time

Such expansion would allow for:

- increased precision
- improved reproducibility
- broader comparative validity

4. Multi-Comparator Integration

WEP is not limited to pairwise comparison.

It can be extended to:

- multi-worldview analysis
- ranking systems based on convergence scores
- clustering of worldviews based on domain performance

This enables the framework to function as:

a comparative mapping tool rather than a binary evaluative system.

5. Interdisciplinary Relevance

Due to its multi-domain structure, WEP intersects with several fields,

including:

- philosophy of religion
- epistemology
- philosophy of science
- sociology of knowledge
- comparative religion

As such, the framework may serve as:

- a tool for interdisciplinary analysis
- a bridge between otherwise disconnected domains of inquiry

6. Replicability and Independent Application

For WEP to achieve broader validity, it must be:

- applied independently by other researchers
- tested across alternative datasets
- evaluated under varying evidentiary standards

The framework is intentionally constructed to allow:

- independent replication
- methodological transparency
- comparative verification

7. Boundary Conditions

Despite its generalizability, WEP operates within defined boundaries.

It does not:

- establish metaphysical truth
- resolve all philosophical disputes
- eliminate the role of interpretation

Instead, it provides:

a structured method for organizing and comparing explanatory performance across domains.

8. Summary Position

The Worldview Evaluation Protocol is best understood as:

- a general evaluative framework
- a scalable comparative system
- an extensible methodological tool

Its current application represents:

a proof of concept rather than a final or exhaustive implementation.

The long-term value of WEP depends on:

- continued application
- critical evaluation
- refinement through broader use

In this sense, the framework is not presented as a finished system, but as:

an initial contribution to the development of structured, multi-domain epistemic evaluation.

24

Extension to Additional Worldviews

While this work presents a baseline comparison between Christianity and Naturalism, the framework itself is not limited to these systems.

WEP is fully extensible and may be applied to:

- other religious traditions
- hybrid philosophical systems
- alternative metaphysical models

Future applications may explore how different worldviews perform across the same domains under identical evaluative criteria.

The present analysis should therefore be understood not as a final ranking of all systems, but as an initial demonstration of how cross-domain convergence can be measured and compared.